

THE CLERGY REVIEW

NON-INFALLIBLE DECISIONS: ANOTHER POINT OF VIEW¹

BY THE REV. E. C. MESSENGER, Ph.D.

IT is, of course, admitted by all Catholics that the Church is our Infallible Teacher in all that concerns faith and morals. This follows from the very existence and Divine institution of the Church, as recorded in the Holy Gospels. "Going therefore, teach ye all nations."² "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; he that believeth not shall be condemned."³ These texts may rightly be quoted in support of the Church's Divine mission to teach religious and moral truths, and further, in view of the fact that our salvation is to depend upon our belief in what the Church thus teaches, we may rightly infer that such teaching, imposed upon pain of damnation, must be infallible, for it is impossible that God, the Sovereign Truth, should thus bind us to believe something which might be untrue. These texts may also rightly be urged in support of the infallibility of the *ordinary* magisterium of the Church, as distinct from her *solemn* magisterium, and indeed, this might even be said to be their primary meaning, for it is unthinkable that the Church should exercise her divine magisterium only upon the comparatively rare occasions when a solemn definition is put forth by an Ecumenical Council, or by the Pope speaking *ex cathedra*. In this connection it is worthy of remark that there were no solemn decrees

¹ Suggested by the article by the Rev. Dr. Smith in the CLERGY REVIEW for April, 1935.

² Matthew xxviii. 19.

³ Mark xvi. 16.

of Ecumenical Councils or *ex cathedra* definitions until the year A.D. 325, but the Church had obviously exercised her Divine mission before the Council of Nicea, and the faithful were also before that time bound to believe her teaching under pain of damnation.

But in addition to this two-fold exercise of the Church's office, the solemn and the ordinary magisterium, there is another less definite teaching which has been set forth from time to time by the Church, which we may describe as "non-infallible" teaching. In our own times, this teaching is for the most part embodied in Decrees of Roman Congregations. Hence arises the delicate question of the *grounds* of the Church's claim thus to teach non-infallibly, and the precise nature of the *assent* which is due to such non-infallible decisions.

It seems to the present writer that one cannot fairly appeal directly to the texts quoted above, "Teach all nations. . . . He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved," as immediately justifying such non-infallible teaching, for the teaching referred to in these texts must be believed if we wish to be saved, and as we have seen above, such teaching must be *infallible*. The Church's right to teach non-infallibly must rather be justified by a reasoned inference from the general commission given to her. God has instituted the Church as the exponent of the Christian Revelation, especially in matters of faith and morals. But reflection will show that the Church could not adequately and satisfactorily fulfil this task if she could not also express her mind upon matters more or less closely connected with Christian dogmas. This will justify the Church's teaching of dogmatic facts, etc., and in view of the close connection between such matters and the doctrines of Revelation, theologians are justified in extending the infallibility of the Church to these points also. But the same reflection will show that the Church's power must extend beyond even such matters as dogmatic facts, and that, as Pope Pius XI has said, the Church has power and authority "not merely in regard to her proper end and object, but also in regard to the means necessary and suitable to attain that end. Hence with regard to every other kind of human learning and instruction, which is the common patrimony of individuals and society, the Church has an independent right to make

use of it, and above all *to decide what may help or harm Christian education*. And this must be so, because the Church as a perfect society has an independent right to the means conducive to its end."⁴

But, evidently, the more remote the connection of this extraneous subject-matter with the Church's proper function, that of teaching faith and morals, the less will be the necessity that she should be endowed with infallibility in such teaching, and the less absolute will be the assent she requires to such teaching. And this will be the more evident if it is remembered that in such matters of merely human knowledge, as distinct from divine knowledge given in Revelation, mankind makes very slow progress, and indeed proceeds by what may be described as "trial and error."

This gives us a sufficient justification for the Church's right to teach matters which are outside the sphere of Revelation but not out of all relation to it. But, in view of the fact that, as we have said above, definite progress is to be expected in man's knowledge of such matters, and consequent revision from time to time of hitherto accepted judgments and opinions, we have a right to expect that the authority which the Church undoubtedly possesses in these things should not be exercised in such a way as to hinder the progress of human knowledge. And to come to decisions of Roman Congregations, which form concrete examples of this non-infallible teaching of the Church, we should expect the assent due to such decisions to be defined and explained in such a way that progress in knowledge shall always remain possible.

Now when we turn to the Church's theologians, we find precisely that the assent which they describe as due to these decisions is in fact limited and conditioned in such a way as not to prevent further progress.

In the first place, we find that theologians carefully explain that *the assent we give to propositions set forth by Roman Congregations is to be varied according to the truth of the proposition viewed in itself, and according to the gravity of the reasons for which it is set forth*:

⁴ Pope Pius XI, Encyclical on the Christian Education of Youth, C.T.S. edition, pp. 7-8. Italics are mine in this quotation, and also throughout this article.

. . . inter rei in se spectatae veritatem et momentum quibus suadetur gravitatem distinguendo, assensum præstare qui his momentis respondeat.⁵

This is a very fruitful principle, which admits of very varied application.

Secondly, we must note that there is excellent theological authority for maintaining that *Roman Congregations do not teach that any given proposition is speculatively true or false, but rather that it is, or is not, a safe one to hold or teach.* Thus, Cardinal Franzelin says that doctrinal decisions of Roman Congregations require:

non quidem ut credatur doctrina infallibiliter vera aut falsa . . . sed ut judicetur *doctrinam in tali judicio contentam esse securam*, et nobis non quidem ex motivo fidei divinae . . . attamen ex motivo sacrae auctoritatis, cujus munus indubitatum est prospicere *sanitati et securitati doctrinae*, mentis obsequio amplectendam ac contrariam reiciendam.⁶

Billot develops this idea as follows:

Fit distinctio inter decreta quibus veritas speculativa infallibiliter definitur,⁷ et decreta quibus securitati doctrinae prospicitur, *quin deveniatur ad formales definitiones.*⁸

And again, as Dieckmann puts it, utilizing Billot:

Intentio decreti Congregationis eo fertur ut declaret authentice "aliquam doctrinam *esse tutam*, hoc est, consonam regulæ fidei, *ea saltem probabilitate quæ sufficiat*, ut quis possit illam amplecti; vel e contra, aliquam doctrinam non esse tutam, seu esse discordem a regula fidei, idque iterum tali saltem probabilitate quæ non habeat adjunctam sufficientem probabilitatem de opposito." Propter legitimam deinde auctoritatem, quæ tale decretum fert, "jure meritoque exigitur interior mentis obedientia," quæ "tenemur judicare doctrinam hanc (damnatam) esse—*non dico in se erroneam aut falsam aut si quid aliud ejusmodi, sed—simpliciter non tutam*,

⁵ Wilmers: *De Christi Ecclesia*, 1897, p. 451.

⁶ *De divina traditione*, 1883, 131.

⁷ That is, infallible decisions of the Church.

⁸ *De Ecclesia Christi*, 1899, Vol. II, 117.

eique tanquam non tutae amplius non adhaerere."⁹

Again, Choupin, in his article in the *Dictionnaire Apologétique* on the *Curie Romaine*, writes as follows:¹⁰

If the Holy Office declares by an authentic decision that a proposition is true or erroneous, I ought to say and believe interiorly, *not that the proposition is true or erroneous absolutely*, as if there were question of a definitive judgment irreformable in itself, but that it is *not imprudent but safe to regard this proposition as true or erroneous*, or rather, that *this proposition is safe, or is not safe*.

It is surely significant, in this connection, that the Code of Canon Law should say that the Holy Office "safeguards" the teaching of faith and morals:

Congregatio S. Officii . . . *tutatur* doctrinam fidei et morum.¹¹

In view of all this, it would be exaggerating to say *tout court* that the Decrees of Roman Congregations are to be accepted as "morally certain." Rather, they are to be accepted as, in the present state of knowledge, very probably true, and as "safe" to hold and teach, *as opinions*. It would certainly not be correct to say that Catholics are bound to "believe" these decisions, unless it is made perfectly plain that "belief" here means, not certitude, such as that by which we believe the doctrines of the faith, but rather "belief" in the popular sense of a generally or widely held *opinion*.

Accordingly, Maroto says that the assent to a decision of a Roman Congregation is to be "condicionatum" and "prudentialem."¹² And even those theologians who say that these decisions are "morally certain" hasten to add that this expression is to be taken *in a very wide sense, as signifying only a high degree of probability*. Here are some instances:

Pesch: *Certitudo hujus assensus non quidem est*

⁹ *De Ecclesia*, 1925, II, p. 122. I have made great use of Dieckmann's excellent work in the present article.

¹⁰ *Op cit.*, Vol. I, col. 880. The translation is my own.

¹¹ Canon 247.

¹² *Institutiones Juris Canonici*, 1919, I, 418.

metaphysica, sed moralis quaedam sensu latiore quae qua talis non excludit omnem formidinem erroris.¹³

Schiffini: Assensus est *opiniativus*, ac per se *obnoxius falsitati*, cujusmodi est quaevis *opinio*, *etiamsi contingat eam esse unice probabilem*, ut esse solent plura *judicia prudentialia*, quibus mores humani reguntur.¹⁴

Choupin: Our assent is not metaphysically certain . . . but it is morally certain. . . . But *this moral certitude must be understood in a broad sense*; when we are dealing with a speculative judgment on the truth or falsity of a doctrine, it is characterized by a very high *probability*; theoretically it is *not certitude strictly so called*, or the firm assent which excludes of itself all doubt.¹⁵

Forget: Although they are not infallible, the doctrinal decisions of the Congregations are *in a certain way* binding on the very belief of the faithful. . . . We owe to them the submission of our intelligence, a true internal assent—not, indeed, the assent of faith, whether immediately or mediately divine, for this is due only to the Word of God or to things necessarily connected with Revelation, *nor even an absolute assent*, but an assent which is *prudentially and provisionally firm*, being thus proportioned to the degree of trustworthiness which the Congregation possesses in virtue of the mission it has received from the Church, and which it exercises under its direction and with the general assistance of the Holy Ghost. . . . A Catholic is obliged to adhere internally to the teaching of lawful authority *so long as it is not evident to him that a particular assertion is erroneous*.¹⁶

Lastly, Straub¹⁷ describes the assent as “*condicionatus, propter possibilitatem erroris*” and adds this very

¹³ *Praelect. dogmat.*, 1924, I, p. 369, n. 521.

¹⁴ *De Virtutibus Infusis*, 1904, p. 215.

¹⁵ *Dictionnaire Apologétique*, art. cit., I, col. 880.

¹⁶ Article, *Congrégations Romaines*, in *Dictionnaire de Théologie*, Vol. III, col. 1110. The translation is my own.

¹⁷ *De Ecclesia Christi*, 1912, II, p. 347.

luminous and significant statement:

Ecclesiae filius . . . ita est dispositus ut assensum . . . retinere minime vellet si quando Ecclesia per sententiam jam ultimam et infallibilem aliter judicaret vel ipse rem veritati repugnare deprehenderet.

It is precisely this *conditional* and *prudential* character of the assent due to Roman decrees that explains how and why a later decision may allow that a doctrine formerly condemned may now "safely" be held. As Dieckmann puts it:

*Quia iudicium de securitate doctrinae alicujus veritatem non immediate tangit, fieri potest ut doctrina aliqua non tuta, re melius perspecta, possit evadere tuta. . . . Sententia autem "declarans tutum id quod prius tuto teneri non posse fuerat edictum, non esset stricte loquendo reformatio sententiae, sed nova declaratio, non contraria priori."*¹⁸

And just as the new decision is not really contrary to the old one, so also *the change in internal assent is not so unreasonable and impossible as it would surely be if it had been absolute and unconditioned in the first instance.*

Another important point to note is that the character of the assent required will vary with the position and state of knowledge of the individual Catholic. The ordinary member of the faithful, who has no special knowledge of the subject, will naturally have implicit trust in the knowledge and wisdom of those who have made the decision in question, and will be quite ready to prefer their judgment to that of other individuals of whom he has heard. *But even so, he is not expected to "believe" the decisions absolutely, but to hold them as safe, and as most probably true.*

In cases of simple difficulty or doubt, as Choupin says, "the presumption is always in favour of Authority."¹⁹ Or again, as Wilmers says, "Congregationes recte decre-

¹⁸ *De Ecclesia*, 1925, Vol. II, p. 123, quoting Billot: *De Ecclesia*, 1899, II, c. 118.

¹⁹ *loc. cit.*

visse eousque praesumere licet donec rationibus certis contrarium probatur."²⁰

What, however, is the position of a person who is acquainted with the subject-matter of the decree, and has serious reasons for doubting its accuracy? Here the theologians are divided. Some say that a person in this position should submit his difficulties to the Congregation which has published the decree, and abide by its ultimate decision. Thus Choupin:

If, exceptionally, we have serious reasons for doubting, then humbly and respectfully we could present them to the competent authority.²¹

And Tanquerey:

Si tamen, in aliquo casu extraordinario, docti catholici censerent graves rationes contra decisionem datam militare, possent privatim ac reverenter eas S. Congregationi proponere, dummodo parati essent ultimo ejus decisioni acquiescere.²²

But Lehmkuhl, on the other hand, would allow such a person to *suspend his internal assent until an infallible decision on the subject should be available*:

Plane impossibile non est, Romanam Congregationem a vero aberrare. . . . Si viro docto gravissimae appareant rationes, non ilico quidem illis assentire debeat, sed sine temeritate *assensum tunc liceat suspendere*, doctrinam reprobata non affirmando, neque positive negando, *donec recursus ad altiore auctoritatem, scilicet Romani Pontificis infallibile iudicium, factus sit.*²³

Similarly Straub says that if a decree were "certo falsum, sive rationi . . . solidae . . . oppositum," it would be lawful

*dissentire vel dubitare, vel sententiam discrepantem adhuc probabilem existimare*²⁴

²⁰ loc. cit.

²¹ loc. cit.

²² Syn. dogm., 1927, I, 574.

²³ Theol. Mor., 1910, I, n. 419, p. 240.

²⁴ loc. cit.

not publicly, indeed, but "servandum obsequiosum silentium."

And Père Fernandez, S.J., in his contribution to the introductory volume of the *Institutiones Biblicae*, the official text-book of the Pontificio Istituto Biblico, says :

*Hunc assensum in quibusdam adjunctis licite suspendi, immo et revocari posse. . . Si vir peritus et prudens, re attente considerata, et omnibus argumentis hinc inde accurate perpensis, sibi persuadet decretum non respondere veritati, licet illi assensum internum suspendere, vel etiam iudicium decreto contrarium admittere.*²⁵

He adds, of course, that "motiva sive dubitandi, sive iudicium revocandi, non facile, immo aegre admodum sunt admittenda." Even Choupin makes a similar allowance in such a case, though he regards it as "excessively rare" :

Finally, we will not examine the case in which a particular believer imagines that he has evidence of the truth of a condemned proposition. . . . We may regard as almost chimerical, or at least excessively rare, the case in which *the duty of an individual, in presence of a decision of this kind, would consist merely in respectful silence.*²⁶

But though rare, the case is not rejected as an impossible one.

We may illustrate these principles by taking a particular decision. On June 5th, 1918, the Holy Office declared that three propositions concerning the knowledge possessed by Christ could not safely be taught. One of these propositions was as follows :

Certam non posse dici sententiam quae statuit animam Christi nihil ignoravisse.²⁷

Applying our principles, we can say, to begin with, that, as one writer puts it, "the Holy Office did not define the speculative truth implied in this decision, i.e., the truth that 'in Christ there was no ignorance.'"

²⁵ 1927 edition, Vol. I, p. 401.

²⁶ *loc. cit.*

²⁷ *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, X, 282.

That being so, it would be incorrect to say that, because of this decree, "A Catholic *must* hold it as certain that Christ was ignorant of nothing." The Decree says it is *safe* to hold it as certain, and that it would be *unsafe* to teach the opposite. This particular Decree is thus commented on by Dieckmann:

Sensus hujus responsi ita circumscribi potest: *Secundum statum quaestionis et investigationis in rationes quae contra has propositiones militant, ipsae hae propositiones tutae dici nequeunt; quapropter omnis qui eas amplectatur, periculo errandi in fide sese exponit, atque hoc declaratur ab auctoritate doctrinali legitima. Huic proinde decisioni debetur obedientia intellectualis, quae assensu certo hoc iudicium (propositiones rejectas esse non-tutas) suum facit. Cum porro agatur de re gravi (periculo errandi in fide), conjungitur cum ea, ut cum gravi decisione, obligatio sub gravi ut admittatur, nisi, ut supra dictum est, rationes plane evidentes theologum eruditum in sua scientia dispensent ab assensu interno atque obligent ad solum silentium reverentiale, quo abstinet ab impugnatione talis decreti.*²⁸

If this be the case in a decision so closely connected with a dogmatic truth, *a fortiori* similar principles will apply to decisions which are not so closely related.

It should be obvious that this kind of prudential, conditioned, "opinionative" assent does not in any way prevent further investigation of the particular questions involved by competent Catholic scholars. And for a proof of this statement we have only to take a concrete instance in recent times. In 1897, the Holy Office, the Supreme Tribunal of the Holy See, declared that the authenticity of the "Three Witnesses" text in I John could not safely be denied, or called in question:

Utrum tuto negari, aut saltem in dubium revocari possit esse authenticum textum S. Joannis in epistola prima cap v, vers. 7, quod sic habet, "Quoniam tres sunt. . . ." Negative.²⁹

Obviously this might seem to imply that the question

²⁸ *De Ecclesia*, II, p. 123.

²⁹ *Apud Tanqueray: Syn. Dogm.*, II, p. 363.

was a closed one for Catholics, seeing that it was forbidden even to question the authenticity. But, in point of fact, that was not at all the intention of the Holy Office, as we gather from a statement published by Cardinal Vaughan the very next year:

I have ascertained from an excellent source that the decree of the Holy Office on the passage of the Three Witnesses, which you refer to, is not intended to close the discussion on the authenticity of that text. The field of biblical criticism is not touched by this decree.³⁰

Accordingly, many theologians, including some noted for their conservative spirit, questioned the dogmatic character of the decree. In this connection, the late Dom Hildebrand Höpfl, himself a consultor of the Holy Office, remarked in his *Introductionis in Sacros utriusque Testamenti libros Compendium*, that the question was not settled by the decree, and added:

Plures auctores asserebant hanc decisionem esse decretum disciplinare, quo interdicatur quominus pro libitu suo quisque Comma Joanneum expungere vel in editione textus N.T. omittere possit.³¹

In a footnote he gives the names of Mangelot (*Le Comma Joanneum*, 1907), L. Janssens (in *Revue bénédictine*, XXIII, 1906, 117-19), and Lamy (*La décision du Saint Office*, in *Science catholique*, XII, 1908, 97-123). To this we may add that in 1905 an eminent Catholic scholar, Künstle, published an important work,³² unfavourable to the authenticity of the text in question. Finally, the position was made perfectly clear by an official explanation of the Decree of 1897, issued by the same Holy Office in 1927:

Decretum hoc latum est, ut coerceretur audacia privatorum doctorum jus sibi tribuentium authenticam commatis Joanni, aut *penitus* rejiciendi, aut *ultimo judicio* saltem in dubium vocandi. *Minime vero impedire voluit, quominus scriptores catholici*

³⁰ See *Revue Biblique*, Vol. VII, 1898, p. 149.

³¹ *Op. cit.*, Vol. III, 1931, pp. 451-2.

³² *Das Comma Joanneum auf seine Herkunft untersucht*, Freiburg, i/B.

*rem plenius investigarent, atque, argumentis hinc inde accurate perpensis, cum ea, quam rei gravitas requirit, moderatione et temperantia, in sententiam genuinitati contrariam inclinarent, modo profiterentur se paratos esse stare iudicio Ecclesiae, cui a Jesu Christo munus demandatum est Sacras Litteras non solum interpretandi, sed etiam fideliter custodiendi.*³³

Here, then, we have an official explanation of the meaning of "tuto negari, aut saltem in dubium revocari" as used in the original decree. Further investigation is by no means excluded, and even the entertaining of an opinion contrary to that defended in the Decree of 1897.

These considerations should serve to show that, when properly understood, the decisions of Roman Congregations are characterized by wisdom and moderation. *They are not in any way intended to impede progress, and they claim no more than the prudential, conditioned and "opinionative" assent required by the non-infallible character of the authority which puts them forth, and even this assent may be suspended if evidence should be forthcoming of the incorrectness of the decision.* It would therefore seem an exaggeration to say that such decisions are absolutely binding on the belief of the faithful.

³³ Apud Höpfl, *loc. cit.* Italics mine, as before.

DID JACOB TELL A LIE?

(Gen. xxvii. 1-24).

BY THE REV. H. W. R. LILLIE, S.J., M.A.(Oxon).

DID Jacob tell a lie? On this point there has been from early times a lively dispute between saints, theologians, moralists, canonists, scripture scholars, scholars of all kinds and philosophers.

Plato had laid it down that lies though unbecoming for God were sometimes profitable for men. He forbade private citizens to lie, but those in public office, such as doctors and statesmen, might do so if it were for the common good.¹ Influenced by this teaching a number of early Christian writers considered lying permissible if circumstances rendered it necessary or useful. Thus, Clement of Alexandria did not think it wrong for a doctor to lie to a patient for the benefit of his health.² Truth is a solid food, but it does not so easily appeal to everyone.³

It occurred to Origen that a very useful confirmation of this doctrine could be found in the example of the Patriarch Jacob. "A man who has to lie," he says, "should imitate the patriarch Jacob, who, we read, got his father's blessing by the trick of a lie. From which it is plain that unless we lie in this way for the purpose of getting some good thing, we shall be considered as enemies of Him who says 'I am the Truth.'"⁴

This opinion met with a mixed reception. St. Jerome characterized it as a pact with the orgies of lies. "Origen wrote these words," he says. "We cannot deny it . . . and he teaches that professors may lie though their pupils may not do so. He therefore who lies well, and without shame, says to his brother whatever comes into his mouth, proves himself to be an excellent pro-

¹ Rep. Book II (382c); Book III (389b).

² Strom. Lib. vii. c. ix.

³ Eusebius, Lib. de Prep. Evang. 31 (cited from Pererius, cf. infra). Compare Hilary Pict. Tr. iii. in Ps. xiv. n. 10.

⁴ Origen, Strom. vi. : cited by Jerome in Apol. contra Ruf. i. 18.

fessor.”⁵ On the other hand, Origen’s view was recognized by St. John Chrysostom,⁶ and was by him handed on to his famous disciple, the Abbot Cassian. In his conference of the Abbot Joseph, Cassian says that lying is to be used rarely like the purge hellebore, which is profitable only when the patient is in a serious condition. “Who could count up all the patriarchs and the innumerable holy men, some to protect their life, some for the desire of a blessing, some for money, some to hide a mystery, . . . some to get at the truth, who have patronized lying? . . . Jacob lied because he knew that he could not get his father’s blessing in any other way. . . . So that you see it is not the doing of the deed that matters, but the purpose in the mind of the doer.”

Once a scriptural sanction had been found for necessary and useful lies, developments soon followed. It struck the adherents of Priscillian, a Spanish heretic of the fourth century, that they might usefully take Jacob as their patron. If Jacob could without blame conceal his identity from Isaac by telling a lie, could not a man persecuted for his Faith tell lies with a good conscience to conceal the fact that he was a Christian? Horrified by such an impious suggestion, a writer, greater even than Jerome, took up his pen—St. Augustine of Hippo. Many lines of argument were possible. Which one would Augustine choose? He might admit that Jacob lied, dwelling at the same time on the imprudence of imitating great men in their weaker moments. Or he might point to the evils that attended Jacob in his latter days and so draw the moral that liars fall on hard times. Whatever the speculations may have been, the line that Augustine actually took can hardly have been predicted by anyone. His reply was startling and effective. He announced that Jacob did not tell a lie at all. “Non est mendacium, sed mysterium.” Jacob’s words can only be called a lie in their literal sense. But Jacob was not speaking literally. Inspired by the Holy Ghost, he was speaking in language figurative and mystical. He put on goat skins, which were a type of sin, signifying Him who bore not His own sins but the sins of others. And

⁵ Jerome, loc. cit.

⁶ Chrys. Hom. 53 in Gen.

⁷ Coll. xvii. c. 17.

when he told his father that he was Esau the firstborn, he was mystically foreshadowing the casting out of the Jews and the substitution of the Gentiles in their place, even as he was substituting himself in the place of Esau. "Since therefore such true things are so truly expressed, why should we imagine that these words and deeds are lies? If they are, then all the parables, types and figurative speech signifying anything at all must be called lies; which is nonsense."⁸

The enormous influence exercised by Augustine can hardly be better attested than by the ready and lasting approval accorded to this ingenious and happy, if unexpected, solution.⁹ Even though it might puzzle the Priscillianists, the Christian Fathers contemplated it with reverence and satisfaction. By a stroke of the pen a wicked calumny about the Patriarchs had been made to vanish as if by magic. For though no one had thought of it before, it now appeared obvious that what was literally a lie could by the interposition of the Holy Ghost assume the nature of a profound mystery. In this light Jacob's exploit took on a new dignity. By considering the story in an allegorical manner, said St. Gregory the Great, a man of exalted feelings "will forthwith rise from history to mystery."¹⁰ Following this advice numerous saintly writers of the Middle Ages—St. Thomas Aquinas,¹¹ St. Bonaventure,¹² St. Albertus Magnus,¹³ together with lesser men like Alexander of Hales¹⁴—all rose to the heights recommended by Gregory and Augustine.

They soon found further arguments for Jacob's innocence. The Scriptures say that Jacob was a simple man. He therefore not only did not, but could not tell a

⁸ *Contra Mendacium*, c. x., cf. also *De Genesi ad litteram*, ad loc. *De Civit. Dei*, Lib. xvi. c. 57.

⁹ E.g.: Theodoret, in *Gen.*, Q. 80.

¹⁰ *Hom. vi. in Ezech.*

¹¹ *II, II*: Q. 110, a. 3; 3 *Dist. xxxviii.*, Q. I, a. 3.

¹² 3 *Sent. D. xxxviii.* dub 4.

¹³ 3 *Sent. D. xxxviii.*, a 9.

¹⁴ *Summa*, Pt. II, Q. 139, mem. 6. Cf also: *Pet. Lomb*, III *Sent. D. xxxviii.*, *Innoc. III*, cap. *Gaudeamus: tit de Divortiis.*, *Innoc. V*, in III *Sent. D. xxxviii.*, a. 7.

lie.¹⁵ Further research showed that others had behaved as Jacob had done. The Angel told Toby that he was Ananias, Abraham called Sarah his sister, Our Lord Himself said that John the Baptist was Elias.¹⁶ Was not Jacob—even though perhaps he did not know it—just as much Esau as John the Baptist was Elias? The more men pondered on this mystery, the more wonderful seemed to them the action of the Holy Ghost in enabling Jacob not only to tell a lie without committing a sin, but to tell a lie which was no lie at all. The jeers of the scornful and the titters of the incredulous were hushed by the dignified words of St. Albertus Magnus. "The counsels of the Holy Spirit," he said, "should not be spoken about rashly, but rather ought we to venerate them in silence."¹⁷

The consequences of assigning the responsibility for Jacob's deed to the Holy Ghost were possibly not fully realized all at once. Jacob told not one, but at least five lies. He said that he was Esau the firstborn. He said: "I have done as thou didst command me." Isaac had given him no command whatever. He said to his father: "Arise, sit, and eat of my venison." It was not venison but goat's flesh. Also, by using the word "venison" he implied he had been hunting—a fourth lie. Isaac then said to his son: "How couldst thou find so quickly, my son?" Jacob replied: "It was the will of God that what I sought came quickly in my way." These words at first sight appear to be true, but the context reveals at least two implicit lies—a renewed suggestion that he had gone hunting, and the statement that by a special providence the venison was quickly found. Isaac again asked him if he was Esau, and Jacob told his last lie by replying, "I am." It should also be noted that in telling these five lies Jacob involved himself in the sins of fraudulent deception, impiety, theft and blasphemy.

To attribute such a deed to the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, as Augustine had done, was a bold step to take, especially as scripture said nothing at all of any instructions given by the Holy Ghost either to Jacob or to

¹⁵ Bonav., loc. cit.

¹⁶ D.T., loc. cit.: Gratian, Decret. II, c. xvii., Q. 2, c. 19. Cf. texts Matt. xi. 14, Jud. xix., Exod. i., 1 Reg. xxi., 4 Reg. x.

¹⁷ Alb. Mag., loc. cit. supra.

Rebecca.¹⁸ Augustine had exonerated Jacob, but had he not set posterity another problem, how to exonerate the Holy Ghost?

Peter of Poitiers thought that this might be done by means of a distinction. Although the Holy Ghost could not be the author of a lie *in as far as it implied a falsity of guilt*, He could be the author of a lie *in as far as it implied only a falsity of speech*. This seemed to mean that supposing the Holy Ghost was the author of a lie, it would be no sin, though it would remain a lie.¹⁹ The distinction had neatly restated the original difficulty.

Perhaps because he perceived that distinctions of this kind either ignore difficulties without solving them, or shelve difficulties by ignoring them, Duns Scotus, to whom subtlety came naturally, seems to have decided that on the whole it was better to desert St. Augustine. To him it appeared needless to dwell on these figurative meanings, for it was unreasonable to think that the Patriarchs could not and did not lie.²⁰ The same point of view was taken by Nicholas of Lyra, a French Cordelier, who said that he failed to see why we should fret and worry about excusing these holy men. Even if Jacob was a holy man, he was not holier than the Apostles whom we do not trouble to excuse from venial sin.²¹

Such daring departures from orthodoxy did not please the Augustinian party. A Dominican, Thomas the Englishman, indignantly asked "Why should not doctors strive to exonerate from lying and sin the deeds of such great men (as Jacob), highly commended by Scripture when it can be conveniently done?"²² Tostatus, a Spanish bishop, thought that the problem might best be solved by a different distinction. God inspired the idea, but Rebecca was responsible for its

¹⁸ The foundation of Augustine's opinion may rest on Gen. xxv. 23, or on the fact that the Scriptures are the inspired word of God. Possibly he founded it on Ambrose. De Jac. et vit. beat. II, c. 2, n. 6.

¹⁹ Pet. Pict. In Sent., iv., c. 5.

²⁰ Scotus., Q. i., n. 13.

²¹ Lyr. in Gen., ad loc.

²² Thom. Anglus, cited in Pererius (cf. infra), ad loc. Disp. v.

execution.²³ The deceit still remained "a deceit of Divine inspiration," but the details were due to the inventive brain of Rebecca. Others of the party contented themselves with firmly reasserting their belief in the responsibility of the Holy Ghost. Pierre D'Ailly observed that these examples only show how God through good men may deceive others.²⁴ Robert Holcot pointed out that as God does many things to deceive the devils, in the same way Rebecca and Jacob by a special command of the Holy Ghost deceived Isaac.²⁵

These attempts to justify the action of the Holy Ghost were not altogether satisfactory, and by the beginning of the sixteenth century the Augustinians were feeling a little uncomfortable. If they could not succeed in explaining the action of the Holy Ghost, perhaps another way might be found of defending Jacob. Accordingly, it was now suggested by Gabriel Biel and others that when Jacob said "I am Esau thy firstborn" he meant to say "I am Esau—non quoad substantiam sed quoad dignitatem."²⁶ That is to say, Jacob, having previously bought the birthright from Esau for a mess of pottage, could in view of this transaction juridically style himself the firstborn, although in person (or substance) he remained Jacob. But Cardinal Cajetan, O.P., pointed out that Jacob said that he was in person Esau. He did not say, "I am thy firstborn" but "I am Esau thy firstborn."²⁷ Whereupon a second Dominican, Melchior Cano, retorted that such a reply was only that of a respectable theologian ("theologus non ignobilis"). "Let us leave these theologians with their sort of theology and trust to Augustine and those who follow him, for these great men must have had specially grave reasons for their opinions." Whatever Cano might have thought about Cajetan, he evidently thought little better of Biel. For it was obvious that Jacob was Esau not only "quoad dignitatem" but "quoad substantiam" also. This surprising statement Cano proved as follows.

²³ Tost, in Gen., ad loc.

²⁴ D'Ailly, in Sent., Q. 12.

²⁵ Holcot, III, Q. 2, a. 8, mem. 3.

²⁶ Biel, 3, Dist. xxxviii., Q. 1. Biel's idea was anticipated in substance by Gratian and Bonaventure, loc. cit. supra.

²⁷ Caj. in Gen., Q. 74.

St. Paul, in Romans ix., says: "Of those who are of the seed of Abraham not all are sons; but they that are children of the promise are accounted as his seed." Therefore, just as the Gentiles who displaced the Jews, the carnal seed of Abraham, could rightly style themselves the seed of Abraham, so Jacob who by God's will displaced Esau, the carnal firstborn of Isaac, could rightly style himself carnally Esau the firstborn.²⁸

The discussion seemed to be leading towards subtle problems connected with dual personality. If Jacob had become Esau in person, did he still remain Jacob? Perhaps Jacob was not so simple after all. Anyway, it still seemed obvious to the lay mind that Isaac had put his questions to Jacob in order to find out whether he was talking to Esau or to Jacob, and that Jacob had answered those questions by lies to prevent his father discovering that he was talking to Jacob. If his father had known that Jacob by a special disposition of Divine Providence had become Esau both in person and in dignity, it would have been foolish for Jacob to attempt to conceal the fact that he was in person Jacob. And it was precisely because Isaac did not know this that Jacob told his five lies. However, Banez, a third Dominican, seemed quite prepared for objections of this kind. According to him, Isaac was certainly ignorant of the Divine plan when he put his questions. But he ought not to have been. Jacob was replying to Isaac in accordance with the knowledge he ought to have had (and would have had) if he had known what was God's will.²⁹

With the advent of the seventeenth century the Jesuits stepped on the scene. In the year 1601 there was issued at Lyons, from the pen of Fr. Benedict Pererius a Commentary of 1,400 pages—double columns—on the Book of Genesis, devoting four fairly lengthy disputations to Jacob's lie. Lying, said Pererius, is intrinsically wrong, as is clear from reason, scripture and the lives of holy men such as the Abbot Theon, who though he had the charge of innumerable monks, never told a lie.³⁰ The opinion of the Augustinian school

²⁸ Cano, *De loc. Theol.*, Lib. ii. c. 4.

²⁹ Banez, *Comm. in D.T. (De Fid., Sp. et Car.)*, Q. 1, a. 3.

³⁰ Pererius, *Disp. ii.*

seemed to Pererius quite erroneous. He wondered how it could even appear probable to writers who were both Catholics and learned men.³¹ If by God's orders anyone could tell lies, we should never know whether Prophets, Apostles and Evangelists were telling the truth.³² Then it would be all over with Faith and the Holy Scriptures.³³ In Pererius's view, the story of Jacob has no figure or parable about it at all. It is as historical as any other part of the book of Genesis.³⁴ Jacob told a "mendacium officiosum" and good though his intentions may have been, there is no need to excuse him. And just because scripture does not condemn him for telling a lie, we need not conclude that he did not lie; for scripture often tells us of the sins of men without calling attention to their guilt.³⁵

Despite Pererius's clear and reasoned protest, the Augustinian theory found acceptance among a number of leading Jesuits such as Suarez^{35a} and Coninck.³⁶ A particularly ingenious defence of Jacob's use of the word "venatio" (venison) was put forward by Salianus in his ecclesiastical history of the world from the Creation to his own day. He said that he did not see why Jacob should not have used the word "venison" metaphorically, just as hare is sometimes called venison. Does not Pliny say that fishing is serious *hunting*, which is certainly not a lie? And Horace, speaking of men out for money, says that they *hunt* rich widows with apples and sweets. So why should not Jacob say truthfully that he had hunted goats?³⁷

However, most of the Jesuits seem to have thought that even a Patriarch could not be let off so lightly.

³¹ Pererius, Disp. iii.

³² Pererius, loc. cit.

³³ Pererius, loc. cit.

³⁴ Pererius, Disp. iv.

³⁵ Pererius, loc. cit. Pererius concludes by saying that Jacob committed a venial sin.

^{35a} Suarez, De Fid., Disp. iii., §5, n. 2.

³⁶ Coninck, De Moralitate, Disp. x., dub. i. Both Suarez and Coninck speak doubtfully.

³⁷ Salianus, Ann. Hist. ad loc. Horace, Ep., i., 1-77-8.

A Lapide said that such doings as that of Jacob could only be excused by a man with a sort of subtle sub-intelligence such as Jacob certainly had not got. He was simple, straight and white, and merely obeyed his mother.³⁸ Another Jesuit father boldly calls it false devotion and a waste of time to try and excuse either Jacob or Rebecca for what was from start to finish a sheer imposture.³⁹ Laymann and others suggested that possibly Jacob might be excused on the ground of invincible ignorance. Since so many people out of invincible ignorance seem at one time to have thought that lying was permissible, did it not appear likely that Jacob and Rebecca suffered from the same sort of ignorance.⁴⁰ Tirinus, however, did not think that Jacob ought to be excused at all. For he was no longer a boy, but had reached the age of seventy-seven.⁴¹

How old Rebecca was the Scriptures do not say, but she did not escape the criticism of the Jesuits. A Portuguese, Father Benedict Fernand Borbensis, remarks on the pains she took to make goat's meat resemble venison, by employing salts, seasoning and this sort of caterer's trick in which women are proficient. For a woman, says Fr. Borbensis, is wonderful at simulation and deceit—a master-builder of lies both in deed and word. "O unhappy men," he wails, "who daily are deceived and bluffed by wives to whom they have surrendered themselves into slavery! I see no more apt or more expressive symbol of this misery than Isaac. . . . Clearly if a wife be good, modest, bashful, dexterous and clever, if she love her husband, if, in fine, she be a Rebecca, she will make tarts out of a rock."⁴²

During the seventeenth century, a group of Moral Theologians thought they had discovered yet another

³⁸ A Lap. Com. in Gen.; ad loc.

³⁹ Borbensis, S.J. (mentioned below), Com. in Gen. ad loc. Cf also, Estius, in III Sent. D. xxxviii., Q. 3, Salianus, loc. cit., Bonfrerius, Com. in Gen., ad loc., Menochius, Com. in Gen., ad loc.

⁴⁰ Laymann, Theol. Mor., Lib. iv., Tr. iii., c. 13.

⁴¹ Tirinus, Com. in Gen., ad loc.

⁴² Borbensis, loc cit.

new way of defending Jacob. It seemed that Jacob's words constituted one of the earliest known instances of the use of a mental restriction. In his book, *De Justitia et de Jure*, the Jesuit Lessius, said that a man who was asked, lawfully whether he had done a certain deed, could, without sin, reply, "I did not do it," adding mentally, "in prison." Though what he says aloud is in itself false, yet conjoined with what he silently adds, it is true. And in such circumstances he is not bound to utter openly all the words which express his mind. And this is what Jacob did.⁴³ Outwardly he said he was Esau. Inwardly he probably added "quantum ad dignitatem."

An English Benedictine of the Augustinian party, one Barnes, a convert and a man of curious and eccentric disposition, took vigorous exception to Lessius' doctrine. According to Barnes, there was no need to attribute any mental restriction to Jacob at all. His words were, as they stood, exactly true according to the mystical sense in which he was using them.⁴⁴ To this the Lessians could reply that the mystical sense was precisely equivalent to a mental restriction, for as it was not openly expressed by Jacob nor understood by Isaac, it could not have been expressed aloud and must therefore have been added silently. Barnes, however, contended that Isaac did understand that Jacob was speaking in a mystical sense. Isaac intended to bestow his blessing on the eldest son whom the Holy Ghost designed for the blessing. This was Jacob. But Isaac by mistake thought it was Esau. Barnes's book was put on the Index: and the defence of Lessius was undertaken by the Jesuit, Theophile Raynaud, in his work entitled, *Splendor Veritatis Moralis*. In a chapter headed "Infixio Barnesii in limo profundo," he tells Barnes that he wrestles with the argument like Jacob with the Angel until the muscle in his thigh gives way and he falls a victim to his own reply. By admitting that Jacob's words had a true sense, Barnes implicitly admits that they had a false one. If the true sense was not expressly mentioned by Jacob, it must have been understood in Jacob's mind and only subindicated in his actual words.

⁴³ Lessius, op. cit.. Lib. ii., c. 42., n. 47 et seq. Tirinus, loc. cit.

⁴⁴ Barnes, Dissert. contra Aequiv. §40. pp. 380 et seq.

This is exactly what Lessius means by a mental restriction. All the anathemas which Barnes loads on Lessius recoil on his own head, and the words of the Psalmist come true—"caput circuitus eorum, labor labiorum ipsorum operiet eos." Raynaud the Jesuit did not content himself with vehement denunciation. By inscribing himself on the title page of his book as Stephanus Emonerius of the Order of Minor Conventuals, he gave both to Barnes and to the world at large an illustration of the practical advantages which would be served by the use of mental restrictions. Raynaud died of apoplexy at the early age of forty-five. Barnes, after writing another book, was arrested and conducted under a strong escort to Rome, whence he went the way of all flesh in 1661.

But the good that men do lives after them. The doctrine of mental restriction was condemned by Innocent XI in 1679 and thereafter there do not seem to have appeared any further speculations as to how Jacob might best be defended. Perhaps it also helped to make clear the extravagance of the whole Augustinian position. By the eighteenth century Augustine was practically deserted. Calmet, a French Benedictine, asks: "Has God need of Jacob's lies to show forth a mystery? Could not all these things be fulfilled without deceiving Isaac?"⁴⁵ Commentators of the nineteenth century speak in similar terms. "Even though Augustine was a learned philosopher," says Hetzenauer, "that Jacob lied is too obvious. He said he was Esau, the firstborn, without any mental restriction. He went up to his father so that he could touch him and feel his hairy hands and make certain that he was Esau. God undoubtedly intended a mystery, but the mystery lay not in the lie told by Jacob but in the deed by which Jacob supplanted his brother, thereby pre-figuring the substitution of the Gentiles for the Jews."⁴⁶

Nowadays most Biblical scholars admit that Jacob told a lie—inspired not by the Holy Ghost, but by Rebecca. It is not our business to inquire why God per-

⁴⁵ Calmet, *Com. in Gen.*, ad loc. Lamy, *Com. in Gen.*, pp. 170 et seq.

⁴⁶ Hetzenauer, *Com. in Gen.*, pp. 400 et seq. Cf. Lychet, O.F.M.—*Com. in D. Scot.*, 3 Sent., D. xxxviii. (1894), for a modern defence of Augustine.

mitted such a thing to happen, nor to try and discover what good purpose sin and error serve in His plan. Out of evil, He can always bring good. He can tolerate evil deeds without condoning them even as He can tolerate the speculations of good men without approving them. God keeps us all under His fatherly care. And it may be that He permits some of His children to err in order to render the others more vigilant.

THE PREPARATION OF SERMONS

BY THE REV. SELDEN PEABODY DELANY.

CLASSIFIED according to methods of composition, there are four general types of sermons. I give them here in an ascending scale in what seems to me the order of their excellence. Others might arrange them in a different order.

First there is what may be designated as the easy-chair sermon. It is hatched out by a minimum of effort with the aid of a companionable pipe or a fragrant cigar. The sermon thus composed could not justly be called a dream, although it tends to become rather vague and dream-like in texture.

The next type is the sermon the structure of which has been worked out on the feet. *Solvitur ambulando*. The preacher having conceived in his mind a germinal idea takes an hour's walk through the park or in the country. It is amazing how the sub-conscious mind will surrender its hidden treasures of experience and knowledge under such relaxed conditions. The sermon seems to take shape by a sort of emergent evolution without any conscious thinking on the part of the walker. The sermon which has been developed in this way is more likely to contain homely and vivid illustrations from the world of nature and every-day living such as so frequently occur in the public teaching of Our Lord.

The third type may be called the desk sermon, whether hammered out on the typewriter or scratched out with the pen. It is more concise and business-like, more logical and definite than the preceding type, and makes its appeal chiefly to the intellect. There is much to be said in favour of written sermons. Cardinal Newman always wrote his sermons and, in delivering them, he rarely raised his eyes from the paper. Many other of the best sermons of history have been written and handed down as literary and religious gems, such as the sermons of Bossuet or Bourdaloue. No important public man to-day makes a speech without having it

in writing. Why should a preacher, presumably with the most important message, be less eager to avoid inaccuracy and saying the wrong thing? Moreover, on more momentous historic occasions where the preacher must weigh his words carefully, the sermon would necessarily be written out in advance. As a general rule, it will depend upon the individual gifts of the preacher and the character of the congregation whether sermons should be written or not.

The fourth type is the sermon whose subject, aim and method of treatment have been received and meditated on the knees, presumably before the Blessed Sacrament. The priest seeks the divine enlightenment and inspiration for the basic ideas of his sermon and for their logical arrangement and the manner of their presentation. The actual choice of words and phrases he leaves to the moment of preaching. While on his knees, he makes no attempt to quiet his intellectual faculties but puts them energetically to work, with the prayer that the Holy Spirit will teach him what he should say and how he should say it. It is surprising how under such conditions ideas will come to one that do not seem to spring from the customary intellectual processes but to be infused from without.

The thesis which I am trying to maintain is that the most edifying sermons and those best suited to the needs of the average congregation are begun, continued and ended in prayer. Of course, every sermon, however it may be composed, may be and doubtless will be prepared by the help of prayer. I am here speaking of the type of sermon which is worked out entirely on the knees. After the sermon has been thought through and prayed over in this way, its main points must be retained in the mind until it has been preached.

It is essential for the effectiveness of this type of sermon that it should never be committed to paper. Nothing so chills and deadens a sermon as paper—whether it contains only a skeleton outline of the main points or is a complete copy of the sermon. A written or typed manuscript, whether taken into the pulpit or left in the desk, tends to become an impervious barrier between the preacher and his hearers. His attention is necessarily concentrated on what he has committed to paper rather than on the live human beings whom

he is addressing. He will often be trying to remember a special combination of words and phrases in his manuscript; and the congregation cannot wholly avoid an uncomfortable suspicion that he is distracted and is not really looking at them at all. Not infrequently they will suffer grave discomfort from the fear that his memory will slip or even that he will break down completely.

Everywhere except in the pulpit speakers who are trying to convince their hearers are aware that a manuscript is a fatal obstacle to persuasion. The salesman who is trying to induce you to buy an automobile does not read his arguments from a manuscript. The lawyer seeking to win a favourable verdict from a jury, the doctor urging his patient to adopt a more sensible mode of life, the teacher trying to get something into or out of the heads of his pupils, the lover pleading his cause before the young woman of his choice—all these speak from the heart and not from elaborately prepared notes. The speaker over the radio may read from notes, but that is because we cannot see him. When television comes there will be no more manuscripts.

The Catholic preacher has the most thrilling story to tell of all public speakers and he should present it as directly and simply as he believes it. A sermon is worse than useless unless it makes an over-powering appeal to the minds of all who are listening and penetrates their hearts. Therefore, the preacher must so marshal his facts and arrange his arguments that his sermon will fire the imaginations of all who have ears to hear, convince the intellects of the wisest and the simplest and move the wills of the just and the sinners alike to salutary action.

These three purposes of a sermon suggest that the preacher should divide what he has to say into three distinct parts. They should be so distinct that during the intermission the preacher could sit down and wipe his brow as the Italian preachers do after preaching for an hour, thus giving their standing listeners an opportunity to shift to the other foot and glance at their neighbours. Whether the preacher will thus divide his discourse will depend partly on his temperament and partly on the amount of time available for the delivery of the sermon. In a very brief sermon these three parts

would necessarily be fused into one. If our preachers would more generally aim at influencing these three faculties of the soul, their sermons would be characterized by a stimulating variety and they would avoid that deadly monotony which renders ineffective so much preaching of the present day.

It would, of course, be a mistake to suppose that the soul of man is divided into three air-tight compartments known as the imagination, the intellect and the will. The soul is simple and indivisible. The imagination cannot act independently, for the intellect and the will must necessarily co-operate with it. Neither can the intellect act without the will and the imagination nor the will without the assistance of the other two faculties. Yet for practical purposes we may address ourselves exclusively to one or the other of these facets of personality. A ray of sunlight is one thing, yet for purpose of analysis we may break it up into the seven colours of the spectrum.

First of all, then, the preacher should present a vivid picture to the imagination, as if he were describing the burning of a hotel at night or a horrible disaster at sea. No one can help listening to a lively description which makes a scene so real to the imagination that it is as if we were looking at it with our eyes. The preacher may try to bring to life again a scene from the Bible or from Church history, or some moving experience in the life of a saint; or he may delineate a scene from current events or portray a situation in contemporary social or economic life. The greatest preachers in every age have been masters in arousing the imagination of their hearers.

In the second place, one should present clearly and forcefully some dogmatic teaching of the Church as set forth in an authoritative treatise in the field of dogmatic, moral, ascetic or mystical theology. It should be simplified and explained in terms that everybody can understand, and proven either from tradition, Scripture or reason, so that every one who hears it will go away convinced of the reasonableness of the Church's teaching. It is this dogmatic element that gives backbone to sermons. Those without it are spineless and wobbly as a jelly-fish.

Finally, one must appeal to the emotions, for it is

only when the emotions are deeply stirred that the will can be aroused to take action. What emotion should be played upon will depend upon the theme and the occasion. One may concentrate upon the emotion of love of God or love of our neighbour; upon self-respect, hope, confidence, joy, patriotism, or loyalty; upon holy or servile fear, godly sorrow or just indignation; or upon admiration, wonder, reverence. The point is that when any one of these emotions is awakened and stimulated, it causes us to want something so ardently and supremely that we take the steps toward getting it. That is the whole secret of the science of advertising. People are persuaded to believe that a particular article will improve their health, give them a more alluring plumpness or leanness or eliminate the blemishes from their complexions and they will hasten to buy it at the earliest opportunity.

It may be objected that it is impossible for many preachers, especially young preachers, to dispense entirely with a manuscript or at least with an outline which they will keep before them in the pulpit. What I am contending is that the outline, if there must be one, should be in the head and not on paper. I cannot believe that any priest is so feeble-minded that he is unable to retain in his memory an outline of the main points of his discourse. A simple trick of memorizing will make this easy. Let him select the salient word in each division of his sermon so that the first letters of these selected words will spell out a word. For example, if this article were to be delivered as an address to seminary students, I should retain its main points in my memory under the word SPIRES. The points would then be as follows :

S ermon Types
P rayer—Paper.
I magination
R eason
E motions
S implicity.

Simplicity of preaching should be our dominant aim. It has been the characteristic quality of many of the greatest preachers among the saints, such as St. Francis of Assisi, St. Bernardine of Siena, St. Francis Xavier,

St. Vincent Ferrer and St. Vincent de Paul. This simplicity cannot be attained unless the sermon has become an integral part of the preacher. He must possess it wholly and it must possess him. He must feel his sermon, not merely have thought it out as a scheme of argumentation. It must be suffused by his own personality and therefore be such a sermon as no one else in the world could preach. It must be projected from the depths of his being—full of vitality, drenched in experience, life-giving, reassuring and inspiring. His preaching will then have that convincing quality which can come only from sincerity of conviction, seriousness of purpose and simplicity of utterance.

NOTE.—We regret to say that Father Delany died in New York, at the age of sixty-one, while this issue was being prepared for press. A graduate of Harvard, he entered the ministry of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, and quickly attained to an outstanding position. From 1907 to 1915 he was Dean of Milwaukee, and then became rector of the well-known Church of St. Mary the Virgin in New York; he was also editor of the *American Church Monthly*. His submission to the Catholic Church in 1930 caused a sensation in American Episcopalian circles. He came to Europe and entered the Collegio Beda, where he was held in high esteem by professors and students alike. He was ordained in Rome in April last year and in May returned to America to take up his priestly work. But he fell ill, and was in hospital in New York from February last till his death. R.I.P.

THE EDITORS.

SUNSHINE IN ITALY

BY THE RIGHT REV. MGR. CHARLES L. H. DUCHEMIN, M.A.

SUNSHINE in Italy, especially while it is yet young in spring-time, charms you out of doors. It likes to draw you into the country where it will show you a few of its hidden treasures; without this magic lamp they cannot be seen. It is a glorious companion in this time of its youth; it is full of vitality, almost dangerously so; the Romans warn you against sitting in the March sunshine; I wonder why. It is versatile too, changing every moment; reserved, also, because it seems in spite of its brilliance to be partly veiled, and yet it can show you things so clearly that distance does not seem to matter.

Four of us went out with it the other day, all enthusiasts for the sun but viewing it from different angles; we were united in nothing but the priesthood and the love of the sun. Otherwise how different had been our experiences. One had taught in a seminary for a quarter of a century, another was a medical man of great ability, a third had been a journalist holding a high position in one of the best known provincial newspapers, the fourth had been a solicitor. Is there any place in the world where so many different types of men meet and live together happily for four years than at the Beda College in Rome? Perhaps it is only where such ideals of comradeship exist that this kind of company can flourish. "*Toutes les âmes se touchent en Jésus Christ*" is a saying that has a philosophical as well as a religious meaning. It seemed fitting to leave Rome by the Gate of St. John which leads by the Cathedral of the world, and under the shadow of the great figure of St. Francis who loved the sunshine with such proportioned yet passionate devotion. Along the Appian Way you meet wine carts—now only a few, for the motor camion with its utilitarian wand is threatening to throw these picturesque vehicles into an everlasting sleep. A few golfers may be seen playing their farewell games at the Acqua Santa before their links are commandeered by the sun in his fierce manhood of the summer months. The Paoline and Claudian aqueducts, not even yet entirely in ruins, stand out as witnesses of over two thousand years of friendship between their sturdily built walls and the Roman sunshine. The aerodrome is a newer thing, its eagle-like inhabitants hover over your head as you pass by, and look as if they were flying straight into the sun, but that is only as we see them from the ground: that new race of men that live in the air know how insignificant is the distance by which they can approach the source of light, yet I think they must find themselves attached to it with additional

bonds, they who spend so much of their life above the world, alone with the sunshine, and can even pierce the clouds to seek for it.

Albano remains much the same, but the main street has been widened lately and made to look like a country cousin of the new streets in Rome, with stone seats and grass squares where people can sit and take the sun while waiting for the tram. After you leave Albano the sun grows more intimate, and starts showing you all sorts of beauties. You might loiter on the road satisfied, if you knew nothing of the joys to be found on Monte Cavo. You refuse all offers on the way and hurry on for that is the place to take the sun. Perhaps the Romans had discovered the same truth when they made it the federal sanctuary of the Latin tribes and set upon its summit the temple of Jupiter Latialis. It is 3,147 feet high, the crowning peak of the Alban hills, and it commands a grand view of the country all around. Immediately below are the two dark round lakes of Albano and Nemi, aptly called from that view-point the two eyes of Latium. Beyond, on a clear day, you catch the coast line from Terracina (where St. Peter landed) to Civitavecchia (a harbour begun by Trajan and completed in 1535 after many vicissitudes by Michelangelo). On the other side of the hill, looking towards Tusculum, there is a hollow slope (hence, perhaps, the name Cavo or hollow) where Hannibal is supposed by some to have halted in his march on Tusculum and Rome in 211 B.C.; beyond it are grouped rows of hills, the Volscians, the Sabines and even more distant ranges covered with snow. Rome lies away from the hills in a kind of basin, seldom clearly emerging from the mist, but often the most outstanding feature is the dome of St. Peter's which appears incredibly large. Triumphal processions of ancient Romans with all their pageantry would wind up the hill, and the road along which they went is still existing in parts—and used—the identical paving, too. It is still the shortest way up to the summit of Monte Cavo, but there is a more modern road made for motor cars, a fine piece of engineering carried out by a private firm which I believe went bankrupt before they had completed it; the surface is not yet modernized, but all the same you pay a toll of 5 lire. Our own Cardinal Duke of York was interested in Monte Cavo and in 1783 transformed the ruins of the temple on the top into a Passionist Monastery which remained there until 1870 when it was scattered. At present the site is occupied by a small restaurant which, good as it is, seems hardly adequate as the guardian of that lonely but noble height; you cannot help feeling thrilled up there, especially on a fine day; and remember the sun is nearly one mile nearer to you than when you stood in Rome. Growing in great profusion round the summit at this time of year are the lovely little blue squills whose flowers exactly match the deep blue sky, giving a curiously beautiful effect as if of reflections.

You can come down by Rocca di Papa, passing through

Squarciarelli and reach Marino in half an hour, places as jolly as are their names. Before arriving at the Pope's Fort (Rocca di Papa, sanctuary of the exiled inhabitants of Tusculum) you go along a picturesque road cut out of the face of the steep rocky hillside, and you can stop at the famous view-point opposite the Chapel of the Madonna del Tufo (rock). Looking up at the precipitous mountain-side you can easily picture the scene of the miracle here recorded. In days before the steam roller and the macadam and tar-concrete road, a traveller was passing along that lonely path which the winter had made barely passable, when suddenly hearing a noise he looked up to see a huge piece of rock breaking away from the overhanging cliff and falling mercilessly towards him. To seek escape by jumping over the edge of the road would have been as disastrous as to wait for the avalanche. His thoughts flew at once to the Madonna, the Mother of men and of God—a momentary prayer, and lo and behold the great mass of rock embedded itself again in the mountain-side leaving him unharmed. People flocked to see this wonder when he related the story and they built a chapel over the piece of rock and you can see it there to-day. Rocca di Papa is a picturesque town which appears to cling like a sun-lizard on the steep sides of the rock. It is a summer resort and—such is the enterprise of modern scientific research—the road leading to it is one of the test hills for motor car trials. Squarciarelli is well expressed by its name, if you repeat it carefully and out loud to yourself several times. There, also is a peaceful haven for some who have outlived their means, their relatives and their friends; it is run by the Little Sisters of the Poor. Marino, once the stronghold of the Orsini, is described in the guide book—1,165 feet; Alb. d'Italia, on the tram line; Trattoria Bellucci, with terrace and view, noted for excellent but somewhat strong wine. The ground falls into basin-like hollows which seem designed to entrap the sun and wed it to the vines which are planted everywhere. If you pass through Marino's somewhat precipitous and shabby streets and turn down even more unpromising lanes you will find yourself in the midst of those vines (at times you will think that a tank would be a more suitable vehicle than a mere motor car for covering this kind of country); soon it is obvious that you have entered a kingdom where wine reigns supreme—not wine in the bad sense, but rather that sun-conceived product that can gladden the heart of man.

We had a Scotsman in our party, and he led us to the country villa of the Scots College, a handsome building in the midst of vineyards. The present house is quite new, but the Scots have had a villa on the site for many years; every Roman college must have a place in the hill country where its students can live during the heat of the summer. You will not be surprised to hear that the country that has supplied "experts" to every part of the world has not failed to make the most of its position here; some years ago it took the prize for the best wine in the neighbourhood; even now the Scots Villa wine has a high

reputation, and helps to supply the funds for maintaining the college in Rome where young men from Scotland are prepared for the priesthood. This day being a holiday, and as I said very fine and sunny, the rector had brought out the whole college for a day in the fresh air. A simple but well-cooked meal was prepared by the wife of the vine-keeper. The rector showed us round afterwards, and we saw where the wine was made in a large building on the slope of the hill, whose flat roof was level with the terrace in front of the villa, and was used as an extra promenade. Inside you walk through a gallery of huge wine barrels; a door on one side led to an underground passage made in the tufo rock, a refuge for the wine in the summer when the sun becomes unmanageable. And we watched the young men amuse themselves, those youths who would be the parish priests of Scotland to-morrow; some rested, others played with the farm donkey, and were photographed on its back with the Italian servants around, unconsciously making records that would become precious memories in the future; some more active ones played football (fancy this after a fill of spaghetti!), and I saw two magnificent hard tennis courts, the gift of a Scotsman who builds tube railways in England.

I left the party then, for I had to visit some friends who live in the middle of the Roman Campagna not far from the Greek Monastery of Grottaferrata. Their villa stands on the site of an ancient Roman palace, and the ground even now is full of relics of the past glories. While I was there the gardeners who were uprooting a large tree, had dug up a massive piece of white marble that might have been one of a handsome flight of steps. The family is extremely interesting, a Roman aristocrat married to a gifted American of remarkable intellectual powers. The house is charming, reminding one of an English country mansion, and it is staffed by that mixture of intelligence and childlike devotion which goes to make the Italian servant. The English atmosphere spreads when you walk through the beautiful garden, for the hostess is one of the pioneers in growing and exhibiting those flowers that are shown in such perfection by the Royal Horticultural Society in London. There is a dairy upon which was modelled the up-to-date arrangement at the Pope's Villa not far away. There is a school for the children of the shepherds in the wide stretching campagna; and enshrined in the most lovely part of the garden is a small chapel, from which on Corpus Christi a solemn procession of the Blessed Sacrament starts and winds all through the grounds of this patriarchal establishment. The tree I referred to above was being taken to adorn the Holy Father's garden at the Villa Barberini, and is but one of many fully grown pines that have been transplanted there from this remarkable estate. Attached to it also are extensive olive groves which produce the oil that is blessed in St. Peter's on Maundy Thursday. And yet we are told people will not go back to the land because it means a dull life. Surely life is what you have the ability to make of it.

But the day was ending, although the sun was still bright—a

little subdued and redder in colour as if rightfully tired after a day's pleasant work. It had not failed in its promise to light up for us treasures undreamt of, and not easily to be forgotten. My way home lay across the plain of the Roman campagna, and in the evening there is a mist that settles all over it adding a strangely beautiful charm to the fading sunshine. There is a slight chilliness in the air, for the heat of the midday sun seems to be changed into rich colouring. My day's companion, the sun, was descending rapidly, was saying a hasty farewell; it was now only a large dull red disc, almost touching the horizon; my attention was necessarily drawn away from it to the steering wheel as I had to pass a group of wine carts returning home with their sleeping drivers, and when I looked again the sun had gone, but it left behind it a memory as richly various as the colours that began at once to appear in that strange lonely mist that hovers over the Roman campagna when the sun has set.

THE TYRANNY OF THE ORGAN

BY HERBERT ANTCLIFFE, F.R.S.A.

TWO or three decades ago this expression, "the tyranny of the organ," was common in Protestant, and particularly in Anglican, circles. To-day it applies in various respects to the place which the organ takes in Catholic worship. This tyranny arises, like most other kinds of tyranny, from a misconception of the functions of the tyrant by those who fall under such tyranny. It is true that most of the time that the organ has been in use in Catholic churches it has been a matter of experiment. When St. Vitalian brought it first into the churches of Rome in the middle of the seventh century, his aim was that of improving the singing of the faithful generally, although later he gave this up as a bad job and put the music entirely into the hands of trained singers. The principle was established, however, and we find it laid down over twelve centuries later by his late Holiness, Pope Pius X, in his *Motu Proprio* on Church Music in which he says that "although the music proper of the Church is purely vocal music, music with the accompaniment of the organ is also permitted" and "as the chant should always have the principal place, the organ or instruments should merely sustain and never oppress it."

In view of these expressions what is to-day the tyranny exercised by the organ? A tyrant may tyrannize in two ways, first and most obviously by oppressing his subjects or those within reach of his power, and secondly merely by placing himself above the law. And in both these ways the organ of to-day is a tyrant. Let me speak alone of my own experience of such tyranny.

That it is the organ itself, by some subtle influence, that is the tyrant, and not the organist, is evident from the fact that often it is the Parish priest who causes it to exercise such tyranny. Some years ago I held the post of organist at a certain parish church in England from which post I was asked by the rector to resign to make room for someone else on the ground that they "wanted someone who could (or would) make more noise." The organ was much too large for the church, but it had to exercise its full power, whatever happened to the choir of ten and the congregation of a couple of hundred. This is a small example of overpowering influence of the organ which makes its presence in the church to be regarded as second only in importance to that of the altar. In very many parishes in England, Ireland and on the Continent I have been told that one of the first things to be done in erecting a church is to provide for the organ, spatially and financially. Yet the provision of a musician who knows the law of the Church on matters of music, and is prepared faithfully to keep such law, whether it is according to his own tastes or not, is not considered, or not until later.

Among individual cases of the tyranny of the organ the worst is the way in which it insists upon being heard during Lent and at funerals and Requiems. It takes advantage of the permission "that the organ or harmonium should be used to sustain and support the voices," but ignores the following restriction, "but only in plainchant and in cases of actual necessity." Mass without the organ "is so dry," said one of my rectors, while an organist asked why he was engaged at all if, for the Sundays in Lent, he must take his place in the choir or among the congregation of the faithful?

A common way in which the organ is placed, or places itself, above the law is in its use in accompanying plainchant. Wherever one finds reference in the canonical documents of the Church to the use of the organ it is as a support for "the Chant." Yet how often do we hear the choral part of, say, *Te Deum*, with pointed harmonies accompanied by solid diapason organ tone while, when the alternate verses arrive with the plainchant setting, which should be sung by the whole of the congregation, the accompaniment is reduced to a flimsy, and sometimes "fancy" succession of chords and arpeggios that are not sufficient to support a single voice, much less the voices of several hundred unskilled and unschooled people. And like human tyrants who place themselves above the law there is always a danger, and in many cases to-day more than a danger, that the organ falls into doing things quite outside anything the law allows. One remembers in this connection the ban on the use of "noisy or frivolous instruments" contained in the *Motu Proprio*. Yet how often is the organ treated as a frivolous instrument, and handled as the cinema and film organists handle their wonderful but amusing contraptions. The chief failing in this respect is the terrible abuse, by over-use, of the tremolo stop, and after this the habit of playing arias on reed stops that ought scarcely to be tolerated in church organs. "Your organ seems to be suffering from a chronic attack of St. Vitus's dance," said a well-known musician to a Catholic organist. The organist, being a lover of the "pretty-pretty" and consequently somewhat deficient in a sense of humour, failed to appreciate the remark, but it was not altogether lost on some of the bystanders so that slowly an improvement was effected. But the organist to this day does not realize why he may not use the same "charming" effects as he hears his friends use in the course of their work of entertainment. An extreme case, you may say, but, alas, not an uncommon one.

And one could go on for a long time giving similar instances of the way in which the organ tyrannizes over priest and faithful, over liturgy and devotion. Let us be content with one more common case, that of "note-giving" to priest or cantor when there is no necessity, or giving it in such a manner as to distract the thoughts of the one whom it is intended to assist and those of many others.

HOMILETICS

BY THE REV. H. E. CALNAN, D.D.

Twelfth Sunday after Pentecost: September 1st.

Gospel: Luke x. 23-37.

OCCASION.

It was in the autumn of the last year of Our Lord's life. Commentators are not agreed as to whether it was before or after the Feast of Tabernacles (which fell at the period corresponding with the end of September and the beginning of October). The Seventy-two had returned full of joy from their mission. Our Lord had thanked the Father for what had been accomplished; and He had then called on all who were burdened to come to Him for a yoke that was sweet and a burden that was light.

The place was probably on the road between Jericho and Jerusalem; for (a) the neighbourhood seems to have suggested the parable, (b) St. Luke keeps events in due order, (c) Bethany (on that road) was the most likely place at which the Seventy-two would await Our Lord, (d) Our Lord was certainly at Bethany just afterwards (cf. v. 38).

NOTES.

23. "Blessed are the eyes." This was said to the disciples alone, whom Our Lord had taken apart (*κκτ'ιδίαν*). He was referring not to bodily sight and hearing only; for many Jews who saw and heard Him bodily, failed to believe; nor to spiritual perception alone; for many prophets had had spiritual sight of the Messias. The words must be understood of both bodily and spiritual perception together, enjoyed by those who recognized spiritually the Christ the Son of the Living God, and had also the happiness of seeing Him in the flesh and hearing His voice.

25. "Lawyer . . . tempting. . . ." The Greek *ἐκπειράζων* does not necessarily carry the bad sense of our English "tempting." St. Luke, then, does not commit himself: nor need we. On the face of it, it seems a fair question from a man among whose contemporaries the whole question of supernatural eternal life was hotly debated; and the *Διδάσκαλε* is respectful.

27. "Thou shalt love. . . ." The precept is found in Deut. vi. 5. The Jews recited it morning and evening, and it was written in their phylacteries. "Whole heart," i.e., sincerely and thoroughly, excluding rebellion by desire or affection; "whole soul," i.e., with all vital and sensitive faculties subjected to the divine law; "whole strength," i.e., using bodily

powers according to God's Will; "whole mind," i.e., with loyal understanding and will, so that the love is reasoned and deliberate. The love required is thus not merely affective, but efficacious and sincere and appreciatively supreme, keeping the whole man loyal to God in Himself and in His image, man's neighbour.

29. "To justify himself." St. Luke could have added "before men," had he thought fit. He did not.

30. "Among robbers." The road from Jerusalem to Jericho is precipitous and wild and overhung by cavernous mountains; between the two cities it falls some 3,000 feet. (A cathedral congregation once listened to a sermon the lesson of which turned on the allegation that the man went down from Jericho to Jerusalem.) The traveller, after leaving Bethany, sees little more of human habitation until he reaches Jericho some nineteen miles further on. The road was always infested with robbers: murders have been frequent till recent times: to-day, though adequately policed, it is none too safe after dark.

31. "A certain priest." Probably returning to Jericho (he could scarcely be going anywhere else on that road) after his tour of duty in Jerusalem. Jericho was one of the cities reserved to priests and Levites (who had no tribal territory) when Josue distributed the Promised Land among the tribes.

33. "A Samaritan." Samaria during the Captivity had been peopled by Assyrian idolators; but by Our Lord's time they had absorbed many of the tenets of Judaism into their idolatory; they acknowledged Moses and the Prophets, believed in the true God, and looked for the Messiah. But the Jews still hated them as idolators; and they returned hatred for hatred and contempt for contempt. This was the type chosen by Our Lord as the example of a neighbour behaving as a neighbour.

34. "Oil and wine." Scarcely a mixture; but the wine to cleanse the wounds, and the oil to soothe them. St. Luke, "the most dear physician," preserves Our Lord's description of the treatment then applied to wounds.

35. "Two pence." *δυναρία* Roman silver pennies, then equivalent to about 7½d. in modern English money: the ordinary day's pay for a labourer; and the two pence were only an interim payment.

36. "Neighbour to him." Commentators note that Our Lord inverts the order of the lawyer's question. What we should ask is not "Who is my neighbour?" but "To whom should I behave as a neighbour?" Our Lord compels the lawyer to admit that this foreigner—too hated to be named—alone behaved as a neighbour; then

37. "Do thou in like manner." Our Lord prescribed such action as the duty commanded by the Law. The argument is that since the relation of neighbourship is mutual, and since neighbourship can exist between men who had neither blood nor nationality, nor politics, nor religion, nor social intercourse in common, it must therefore exist between all men.

REFLECTIONS.

1. Experience proves that the faithful need to be reassured about the nature of the love which God requires of us. They do not *feel* any love of God, and are quite certain, to their dismay, that their love for children, spouse, parents, etc., is somehow greater than their love for God. It will be good work if we can enable them to see the distinction which matters here.

2. One method may well be to point out that the Incarnation has made it all easier. If we increase our knowledge of Our Lord and His Blessed Mother, they will do the rest, without much conscious adjustment of technical ideas on our part.

3. But the other method is also worth while: to explain the difference between affective love and appreciative love. Affective love just loves and is happy to love, without caring to ask why; it is an emotional warmth which may vary and even collapse if the object becomes disloyal or dishonourable or cruel. Appreciative love is the deliberate adhesion of the will to an object presented by the intellect as good: it is a calm, perhaps cold, discriminating attachment based on judgment and esteem; and if the object receives 'supreme esteem, the love will be appreciatively supreme. That is the love which we must give to God. It may easily be less intense than affective love, but it will be immeasurably more earnest, because deeper and more reasoned. There are Catholics to whose spiritual life the explanation of that distinction acts like the releasing of a leash. The Gospels preserve this distinction, fairly constantly I believe, by means of ἀγαπᾶν and φιλεῖν, (diligere and amare). John xi. 3-5 (in the Greek or the Latin) is one of many illuminating passages.

Thirteenth Sunday after Pentecost: September 8th.

Gospel: Luke xvii. 11-19.

OCCASION.

The time is not clearly indicated. It was during a journey of Our Lord to Jerusalem; but whether for His last Passover, or for the Feast of Tabernacles, it is difficult to decide. The place seems to have been a town in the plain of Esdrelon, on the borders of Samaria; and a local tradition claims it as Ain Gannin.

NOTES.

13. "Stood afar off." Leprosy requiring isolation, these men could not enter the town or come near Our Lord. Perhaps news of Our Lord's approach along this road had gathered this large party of stricken men to wait for Him outside the town. Adversity has its uses; and common misery seems to have surmounted the national hatreds which otherwise kept Jew and Samaritan apart.

"Lifted up their voice." Compare this with "when He *saw*

them": the voice of lepers would scarcely carry "afar off."

14. "To the priests," i.e., in order to obtain the legal declaration that leprosy had cleared up (in otherwise doubtful cases) required by Leviticus xiii. Thus also Our Lord avoided public excitement at the cure of so many together.

15. "One of them." He seems to have known that there is no duty greater than gratitude; and he intended to make known the favour he had received. St. Luke, the physician, mentions the "loud voice" notable in a former leper.

16. "Samaritan." Though not bound by the Levitical law, he had had the faith to obey Our Lord. Then, finding himself sound and well, he knew that Our Lord was above all priests. Moreover, Leviticus provided for doubtful cures, and he knew that there was no doubt about his. So he came back to thank and glorify God. Note also that St. Luke says with emphasis (in the Greek) "*he* was a Samaritan." St. Luke's plan—like St. Paul's—was to show Jesus not merely as the Jewish Messiah, but as the universal Redeemer, giving blessings to heathens like Zacchæus, praising the Good Samaritan, curing the Samaritan here, comforting the Good Thief, etc. It is notable, therefore, that St. Luke alone records this miracle.

17. "Where are the nine?" Their faith had stood the test of being sent, while still diseased, to get from the priests a certificate of their cure. But grateful hearts are rare. And Our Lord showed that to His Sacred Heart man's gratitude—or its absence—does mean something. The concluding words suggest that the gratitude of this Samaritan was rewarded by some additional blessings.

REFLECTIONS.

1. Leprosy with its bodily misery, ugliness, corruption and contagion, is a vivid figure of sin as a spiritual leprosy which afflicts the soul with a misery, ugliness, corruption and contagion immeasurably more disastrous.

2. There is nothing more ignoble than ingratitude. And the grateful heart will know that the Holy Eucharist is well named. Man's characteristic activity as an intelligent agent is to perceive truth; and his characteristic activity as a worthy intelligent agent is to acknowledge the truths perceived. Among the truths to be perceived and acknowledged is the truth of God's Goodness to man, the fact of benefits received. Failure to acknowledge that truth is precisely ingratitude—and, according to St. Thomas, in its grossest form (cf. 2, 2æ, cvii., art. 2). Gratitude may be graded thus: (a) The least degree is to perceive the benefit and to acknowledge it to oneself; (b) a higher degree is to acknowledge it outwardly by praise and thanks; (c) the highest degree is to render (*retribuere*) gifts in return—in due time and place. To fail in (c) is ingratitude; to fail in (b) is baser ingratitude; to fail in (a) is ingratitude in its grossest

form. And it brings that peculiar degradation to man's specific nature.

3. So gratitude seeks suitably precious tokens to be given as thank-offerings to the Benefactor. With adoration and praise, therefore, thanksgiving is at the very heart of the idea of sacrifice. And in the Holy Eucharist as a Sacrifice, we are enabled, in Christ, to render (*retribuere*) to God all that He has given to us. The Holy Eucharist is well named. So the Catholic who grudges the time for Sunday Mass, who neglects precious opportunities of weekday Mass, may well remind himself that ingratitude is not a human failing, but a peculiarly inhuman degradation. (But before concluding that all such ingratitude is grave sin, read 2, 2ae, cvii., art. 3.)

Fourteenth Sunday after Pentecost: September 15th.

Gospel: Matthew vi. 24-33.

OCCASION.

The passage forms part of the Sermon on the Mount recorded in Matthew capp. v., vi. and vii. Our Lord's teaching and many miracles in Galilee had spread His fame throughout Syria; and crowds were coming to Him not only from Galilee, but from Decapolis, and from as far as Jerusalem and Judea in general, and from Trans-Jordania. These He led to the mountain, and there sat and taught them. The place is traditionally identified with a prominent hill west of the Sea of Galilee: it has two peaks, and is called Kurum Hattin, the Horns of Hattin. The time was in the first year of the Public Life, probably the Spring preceding Our Lord's second public Passover.

NOTES.

24. "Cannot serve two masters." The English translation is weak, and open to the objection that men can and do serve two masters. In the Greek the statement is true; for δουλεύειν means "to be a slave to," "to be at the absolute disposal of." A man cannot be all for money and all for God. It is the service, not the possession of wealth that Our Lord condemns. Wealth—if we have it—must be our tool in the service of God: it must not be our master. It becomes our master if we look to it to supply all our needs, or all our desires.

25. "Therefore be not solicitous." Note the "therefore." Undue anxiety about these things will lead precisely to that slavery of avarice. Even for the necessities of life, therefore, the Christian is forbidden to be anxious and diffident. Our Lord adds reasons for confidence:—

"The life more than the meat." God has given us life and body: He can be trusted to give us whatever else is necessary for each.

26. "The birds of the air." God provides in countless ways

for the needs of the lower creation; and He is not their Father. He is ours.

27. "One cubit." No intensity of thought or anxiety will add to such an intimate and personal thing as our stature (or the span of life allotted to us), over which we might hope to have some influence. Then why be anxious about things that are extraneous? It is useless as well as unnecessary.

28. "Lilies of the field." Not of gardens under culture, which do owe something to human industry; but the wild flowers, delicate, abundant, rich. These "lilies of the field" compel the astonished admiration of the traveller who may see their merry parade sweeping in scarlet masses of colourful glory across the slopes and through the valleys around Nazareth, for example, as though revelling in the brilliance and beauty that they bring to the ways where that Mother and that Child often walked, and often surely lingered among these very flowers. Along the roadsides everywhere, in springtime, in the Holy Land, these flowers stand crowding; hemmed in, indeed, between the drab road and the abruptly rising walls of fierce and sullen hills; but crowding gaily and daintily to decorate with their living colour the paths where once He passed. The impression which they made with their beauty upon Our Lord Himself is evident in His comparison of them with Solomon in all his glory: Our Lord's words here come as near as He ever allowed Himself to come to the enthusiasm of a poetic hyperbole.

32. "Your Father knoweth." Paternal care is assured by paternal knowledge. That being so, there is no need for Our Lord to *say* that therefore He will provide. It is supremely unreasonable and unworthy of Christians to behave as though He will not provide.

33. "Seek ye first. . . ." The order is that of intention. We must seek above all things our heavenly fatherland, and the abundance of good works signified by the word "justice," which is the condition of our merit. The word "first" implies that with due subordination to that "first" thing, we must work for the necessities of life, in accordance with the sentence of toil and hardship which followed man's fall; but this we must do, without that excessive anxiety against which the whole of this passage warns us.

"Added," i.e., in so far as they serve towards the principal good of the soul, eternal life: they are not of themselves part of that destiny: they shall be *added*. There may be exceptional cases, real or only apparent, in which the just seem to be destitute. But even the just man may have past offences for which he will willingly make atonement. Our Lord's words concern the ordinary working of Divine Providence; of which the Psalmist gives an apposite summary: "I have been young, and now am old; and I have not seen the just man forsaken, nor his seed seeking bread."

REFLECTIONS.

1. That God guards and governs by His Providence all that He has created is attested by Revelation and by reason, as every priest knows. Our Divine Lord insists on it; and, knowing our needs, of soul and of mind and of body, He bids us not to worry. He reminds us that God's Providence for us is no impersonal control by an impersonal agent, but the active love of our Father in Heaven.

2. The goods of this world are not intended to be the unfailing reward of God's faithful: "He makes his sun to rise upon the good and the bad; and he rains upon the just and the unjust." But even in temporal adversity, the just enjoy peace of soul and spiritual riches; even in prosperity the wicked are often the slaves of debasing passions, and the prey of bitterness and remorse, as well as worry. Sanctifying grace ennobles and enriches the whole personality intrinsically.

3. Life is a probation, a time for work and merit, not for final reward. Final reward must come in the next life; and with that life it must be everlasting. But the most impious of men achieve some good action sometimes: the dishonest business man may be a good father, a faithful husband: the persecutor of Christ and His Church may be charitable to the poor; and so on. Every good action will be duly rewarded; "God will render to every man according to his works." The unrepentant sinner is cutting himself off from an eternal reward; so he must have a reward in this life. On the other hand, few just men have never sinned; and to receive their punishment in this life is, to them, a mercy, and should be an encouragement. It hastens their entry into eternal life. Suffering here enables us to repay to God the consideration stolen from Him by sin; it develops virtues which would otherwise remain weak; it gives a more active and fruitful desire of perpetual happiness to be had only in heaven.

Fifteenth Sunday after Pentecost: September 22nd.

Gospel: Luke vii. 11-16.

OCCASION.

Our Lord had chosen His Apostles, and had made Capharnaum, with its large population and trade, a centre for His preaching in the neighbourhood. He had cured the Centurion's servant, and shortly afterwards, perhaps the next day, came with His disciples and a large following to Naim, a town about two miles from Capharnaum, in time to meet this funeral procession.

NOTES.

12. "Dead man carried out." The dead were buried outside the towns; and the burial-places were deemed unclean.

Christian faith in the Resurrection has changed our attitude to the dead.

13. "Moved with mercy." As usual Luke uses "*ἰσπλαγχνίσθη*," moved to the heart. Notice that Our Lord was not asked to intervene. He, too, was the only Son of a Mother, and her heart was to be torn by the Passion and Death of her Son.

14. "Touched the bier." Touching the dead was forbidden under penalty of uncleanness. The precept could not bind Him who recalled the dead to life, and released him from corruption.

"I say to thee, Arise." Lepicier points out (Diatesseron, I, 443, seq.) that everything that Our Lord does here—His approach, His touch, the silent power with which He stopped the procession, His solemn command to the dead man—gives an impression of greatness, of energy, of something unusual, something in fact miraculous, done by the Lord of His own authority. Of itself, this miracle sufficiently proves that Jesus is God.

REFLECTIONS.

1. Three times Our Lord raised the dead to life: the daughter of Jairus, immediately after death; this young man on the way to burial; and Lazarus four days after death. Such miracles prove Jesus of Nazareth to be the absolute Lord of life and death. Great saints and prophets have indeed brought back the dead to life; but with no claim to do so by their own power; they prayed, they entreated God, they made use of many symbolical actions. (Cf. 3 Kings xvii. 20; 4 Kings iv. 34; Acts ix. 39; Acts xx. 10.) Our Lord's power is in His own command: "I say to thee, Arise." And no appeal to unknown powers of Nature can succeed in evading the reality of such miracles, or their significance.

2. It is always worth remarking that Our Lord could have chosen, in proof of His claim to be divine, to work miracles so spectacular and tremendous as to compel the assent even of the captious and the evil among the onlookers, or among posterity; He could have changed the course of the Jordan, or brought Hermon to the gates of Jerusalem. But in all His works there is the restraint, the balance, the gentleness of genuine power; there is generous abundance of power and goodness, but never extravagance; there is compelling cogency, but room is always left for the honourable and meritorious activity of man's mind in sincere reflection on the meaning of events.

3. Our Lord's choice of miracles seems to have been determined most frequently by His compassion. The miracles which He chose to work are almost without exception works which release someone from trouble; works which indicate the reality and the sublimity of the human emotions which beat upon His Sacred Human Heart. Hunger, pain, disease, death, these things are not sheer evils, not finally disastrous; but the suffering which they bring is human and real: the sorrow is human, and honourable, and even sacred. Therefore His compassion is

moved: His wisdom approves: His almighty power takes action.

Christian holiness is not hard and heartless and inhuman. Its principles are uncompromising, indeed; it will keep first things first; but it knows that second things may be sanctified, and it knows how to sanctify them. So God's saints have always been conspicuous for Christ-like compassion. "Come to me all ye that labour and are heavily burdened, and I will refresh you"; the sincere imitation of Our Master obliges every sincere Catholic not only to a watchful awareness of distress among his fellow men, but to active and willing work for their relief. Yet it is the sad fact that there are many public works for the relief of distress which may do mischief if wrongly directed, which Catholics with clear-cut principles of Christian morality might easily control, but from which Catholics are conspicuously absent. There is something lacking in the tranquil devotion which can be blissfully unaware of these things.

Sixteenth Sunday after Pentecost: September 29th.

Gospel: Luke xiv. 1-11.

OCCASION.

It was a Sabbath, a few months before the Passion. Our Lord was in Peræa, where many Jews lived. Sabbath hospitality was a custom of the Jews. The food was prepared on the "parasceve"; and the meals were often banquets. Our Lord, who came to convert and save sinners, did not disdain to eat with them, and by His example and advice, to draw them to better things.

NOTES.

1. "They watched Him." The Greek is stronger—"they were observing Him closely"—suggesting a hostile intent: they were ready to note any pretext for censure.

2. "And behold . . . a certain man . . ." St. Luke seems to suggest a certain dramatic element in the presence of this dropsical man: it was impossible not to see him. His presence was perhaps arranged: perhaps there was an idea that dropsy, generally regarded as incurable, might defy the curative powers of Jesus; and even if He did cure the man, He could be charged with breaking the Sabbath. It looked like a plot; and St. Luke is content to state the facts and leave his readers to judge. It is one of many examples of St. Luke's dispassionate style of narration. He does not obtrude his own comments, whatever the provocation. He lets events tell their own story.

3. "Is it lawful to heal . . ." As usual Our Lord shows His awareness of the trap, and of their thoughts. He unmasks the trap, and by inviting the plotters to state the right thing to do, shows that they have entrapped not Him but themselves.

Their own plotting left them neither the wit nor the courage to answer: Doctors of the Law, "they held their peace."

4. "Taking . . . healed . . . sent away." Our Lord seems to have healed the man by His very touch, taking him perhaps by the hand. By sending him away, Our Lord not only shielded him from the persecution which was inflicted on the blind man cured at Jerusalem (John ix.), but also made the miraculous cure more widely known and undeniable.

5. "Answering," i.e., to their unspoken thought that He had violated the Sabbath.

"An ass or an ox," ὄνος should probably be υἱός (a son or an ox). The argument is valid in either case. Since work and effort were lawful on the Sabbath for motives of care for property or affection for children, it must be lawful on the Sabbath to rescue a man from a frightful disease, especially when it can be done, as in this case, without servile work of any kind.

7. "Chose the first seats." It serves to exhibit the boorish blindness of pride and arrogance.

10. "May say to thee." The parable is more than merely natural good advice; still less is it an exhortation to the hypocritical pride which apes humility, and would use the externals of humility as rungs on the ladder of ambition. Our Lord is speaking not of the intention which prompts modest behaviour, but of the ordinary result of such behaviour. He is not lecturing on good manners or on worldly wisdom; His purpose is to educate us in the school of genuine humility, by reminding us that humility now means glory hereafter.

REFLECTIONS.

1. Our Lord's lesson on humility was well timed. The same pride and self-sufficiency which led the Jews to seek the highest places at table, led them also to oppose His work, and to try to entrap Him. Pride is blinding, as humility is enlightening; and for the same reason. For humility represents the truth of things, facts as they are: it requires a sense of proportion; and that may explain why the proud are so often dull and heavy and devoid of humour, so often feel hurt and insulted, are so unwilling to learn or to admire or to forgive.

2. But there is nothing more than natural virtue in avoiding futility of that kind. As Christians we must remember:—(a) that all our being comes from God, on loan from Him, to be used in His service. Differences in birth, or gifts, or riches, make no man less or more God's creature than his neighbour; afford no ground for contempt or disdain; (b) that all our endowments, natural and supernatural, come from God. To glory in them as though they were our own achievements, makes us as offensive to God as to deny their existence. The hero, the sage, the saint is not required to believe himself coward or

fool or criminal, or to deny the difference between such men; but remaining what he is, he knows and acknowledges that whatever quality or virtue he has, is due to God's unmerited bounty. In himself he has no cause for vanity; (c) that left to ourselves, without grace we can only sin and frustrate our destiny, without God's Providence we can only fall into nothingness.

3. That was the humility of God's saints: of Our Blessed Lady, who could rejoice that God had regarded the humility of His handmaid, whom all generations thenceforth should call blessed; of St. Paul who was willing to glory only in his infirmities. That is the humility which must make the sincere Christian modest, unassuming, unexacting; enable him to acknowledge and accept God's will in the distinction of men into governors and the governed, with all its practical implications; give him the peace and the tranquil energy promised by the Divine Master Who tells us "Learn of me, for I am meek and humble of heart, and you shall find rest for your souls."

NOTES ON RECENT WORK

I. DOGMATIC THEOLOGY.

BY THE REV. GEORGE D. SMITH, D.D., Ph.D.

The *Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique*¹ continues to forge ahead slowly, eruditely and—as some, at any rate, of its subscribers are beginning to find—rather expensively, the latest half-volume (the second part of the twelfth: PHI-PRE) costing something in the neighbourhood of two pounds ten shillings. Perhaps the most interesting article in this part from the point of view of dogmatic theology is that on *Prédestination*, contributed in sections under the following names: A. Lemonnier, H.-D. Simonin, J. Saint-Martin, B. Lavaud and R. Garrigou-Lagrange; and of these the most important are Section III, in which the R.P. Saint-Martin (of the Augustinians of the Assumption) devotes some sixty columns to a learned study of the teaching of St. Augustine on the subject, and Sections V-VIII in which Père Garrigou-Lagrange traces the vicissitudes of the dogma through the Middle Ages to the present day, concluding with a summary theological exposition.

Père Saint-Martin begins by making an observation which is surely most important for the appreciation of St. Augustine's point of view. It is that according to this great Doctor the mystery of predestination lies not in the difficulty of reconciling the divine action of grace with the freedom of the human will, but rather in those hidden reasons of the divine decree which chooses out some for salvation to the exclusion of others; predestination is mysterious because it is gratuitous. This is the chief pre-occupation of St. Augustine, to humble the pride of the Pelagians by showing them that the elect are saved precisely because they are the *elect*, those whom God has chosen for no other reason than that it was His good will. Human freedom remains. Indeed, freedom in the sense in which St. Augustine understands it—freedom from sin and evil—is the effect of predestination: it is efficacious grace that makes us truly free.

The teaching of St. Augustine, thus interpreted, serves as an admirable introduction to Père Garrigou-Lagrange's interpretation of the doctrine of St. Thomas, i.e., the Thomistic doctrine of predetermining decrees and intrinsically efficacious grace. Moved by this grace man has the power to resist if he wishes, but in fact he never does wish it: "Sous la grâce efficace, à l'instant indivisible où l'acte salutaire se produit, en notre volonté qui déjà se détermine et est déterminée, il n'y a plus sans doute l'indifférence passive ou potentielle à se déterminer

¹ Letouzey et Ané, Paris.

à l'un ou l'autre des deux partis contraires; mais il y a l'indifférence dominatrice actuelle et active dans l'acte libre lui-même déjà déterminé, qui, procédant d'une faculté dont l'amplitude est universelle, se porte *non ex necessitate* ou librement vers le bien choisi, avec le pouvoir réel de ne pas le vouloir." The learned Dominican theologian is most persuasive, and there are moments when the man who "sits contingently but while sitting necessarily sits" seems to throw a bright light on the situation. It is only when one distinguishes between two kinds of necessity that the problem becomes again as dark as ever. By all means it is *logically* necessary that he who sits should sit, however freely he may sit. What remains obscure is the way in which he may sit freely when he is being determined thereto by what appears to be *physical* necessity.

The weakness of the Molinist solution is laid bare by the author when he dwells on the difficulties of the *scientia media*. And, in any case, it is doubtful whether "futuribles" really help us at all. Most of the sorrows of life arise from thinking of what might have been; and the thorny path of the theologian is probably made no easier by the consideration of possible worlds and future acts. It may be long before the true solution of our difficulty is found, but I am tempted to think that we must look for it in the things that are and not in those which might have been.

It is interesting, by the way, to compare the view of St. Augustine's teaching presented here by Père Saint-Martin with another—totally different—view of that same teaching which appears in one of the earliest articles of the *Dictionnaire*, that on *Augustin*. "Our present world," wrote Père Portalé, "with the whole of its history from Adam until the last judgment, is only one of the millions of worlds which God might have created. Among these worlds are some in which all would be saved, others in which all would be lost, others in which some would be saved and some lost. For each individual man there is in the mind of God an unlimited number of possible histories. . . . Such is the knowledge which, according to St. Augustine, precedes and enlightens God's choice: if He had wanted to save Judas, *non defuit modus*, He saw the grace which would save him, He might have chosen it, He preferred another. . . . Without this knowledge . . . neither St. Augustine nor predestination will ever be understood." Curiously, St. Augustine appears here in the guise of a Molinist. It is not thus that he appears in the article *Prédestination*. Which is the faithful portrait?

Père Garrigou-Lagrange's classic *Dieu, son existence et sa nature* is being rendered into English by Dom Bede Rose, O.S.B., of St. Benedict's Abbey, Mount Angel, Oregon. The first volume² has already appeared, and the eminence of the

² Herder. 125.

author in the theological world as well as the close connection of his subject with theology must be our excuse for mentioning what is really a philosophical work under the heading of Dogmatic Theology. Few books have done more in recent years to vindicate the Thomistic proofs of the existence of God, to show the deadly accuracy with which the David of the Schools cast those five smooth stones at the Goliath of atheism; and it was a happy thought to make this most useful work of apologetic available to the English reader. The closely reasoned thought of the French original is admittedly difficult to render in readable English, and a completely successful rendering would be rightly hailed as a triumph of the translator's art. We are not sure, however, that this complete success has been achieved by Dom Bede Rose. Much of his work is beyond praise, but blemishes are not infrequent. Thus, on page 151 the rendering of the French "*ne peuvent . . . que*" as "cannot" makes nonsense of an Idealist objection, while the same mis-translation renders the reply equally unintelligible. *Materia causae* is translated "material cause" (p. 153), "*il n'est besoin de*" appears as "we do need," and a failure to appreciate the nuance of meaning introduced by a "*plus*" on page 119 makes the author say in English what he would never have said in French. The following sentence: "We have always explained (the first affirmation of being) by actual immateriality of the intellect, which by reflection can know not only the fact of its own activity, but the very nature of its act, and of this act towards its own self, which essentially refers to being" is, to say the least, less clear than the author's statement that "Nous l'avons . . . toujours expliquée par la spiritualité même de notre intelligence qui lui permet de connaître par réflexion non seulement le fait de son activité, mais la nature même de son acte, et sa nature à elle essentiellement relative à l'être." On the whole, perhaps those who read French will prefer to continue using Père Garrigou-Lagrange's admirable work in the original text.

II. MORAL THEOLOGY.

BY THE REV. E. J. MAHONEY, D.D.

Undoubtedly, the most considerable and important contribution to this subject during the past few weeks is the new manual by Fr. Henry Davis, S.J., of Heythrop, which appears as the second number of the "Heythrop Series."¹ A new work on Moral Theology in English is bound, in these days, to be welcomed by the educated laity. Their choice, up to the moment, has been limited in England to Slater's Manual—a book which has done most valuable service. From America we have the

¹ *Moral and Pastoral Theology*, by Rev. H. Davis, S.J. Vol. I, Principles, 361 pages; Vol. II, Precepts, 431 pages; Vol. III, Sacraments (1), 504 pages; Vol. IV, Sacraments (2), 386 pages. Each vol. 7s. 6d., sold separately. Sheed & Ward.

work of McHugh and Callan, and a translation, in a number of rather expensive volumes, of Koch. Both of these treat of the Sacraments in a scanty way. It can be predicted, therefore, that Fr. Davis's work will take the place held so honourably by Fr. Slater's in providing for the needs of those who know "little Latin and less Greek." Apart from the pages dealing with the species of sins against chastity, the confessor's duties in the matter, and the nature of impotence, the text is wholly in English.

For the clergy, who are familiar with the Latin manuals, we must make an attempt to define the character of these volumes in comparison with them. In the first place, it must be said that the treatment is generally as full as that given by the ordinary manualist and in some instances fuller. Too often the vernacular manual fails in this respect, which is true even of Slater, since the author usually has the laity in mind. Much space has been saved by eliminating discussions on ancient controversies and comparisons between the views of the more ancient classical authors. These often, indeed, throw light on a problem, but they are usually rather of an antiquarian interest, and may properly be eliminated in a work which aims at presenting, for modern consumption, the common teaching of Catholic moralists at the present day.

It would help, in fixing more exactly the position of this new manual amongst its fellows, if one could name one work, already known, which the present work resembles more closely. This is, in our opinion, the *Theologia Moralis* by Fr. Vermeersch, S.J. The structure is slightly different, Fr. Davis preferring the order of the Precepts, with most of the authors, to that of the Moral Virtues, but the treatment of the matter is very similar. In particular the "Consilia," a sub-title of Fr. Vermeersch's work, is represented in Fr. Davis's by the very useful sections headed "Pastoral Notes." These occur throughout the work, and are a good antidote to that excessive pre-occupation with sins and the careful delimiting of obligations which is becoming the chief trade of the moral theologian.

In one respect, at least, this work is considerably in advance of the ordinary manual. Fr. Davis has been occupied for many years, in the *Catholic Medical Guardian* and other periodicals, with the many intricate problems which are conveniently described as "medical ethics," and he is well known as an authority on such things as sterilization and contraception. He has given us, in the manual, the result of his study, and the reader will find every medico-moral question fully and authoritatively discussed, particularly in Volume II, in the pages dealing with the Fifth Commandment. The publishers have made it possible for us to purchase single volumes, and this Volume II will surely be welcomed by the nursing and medical professions. In other respects, also, the manual is more up to date than most, and takes special account of problems which are peculiar to this country; we are given, for example,

the instructions of the Ministry of Health regarding the teaching of contraceptive methods in clinics, and the declaration of the Hierarchy concerning the obligation of securing for children a Catholic education.

Much care has been given to making these four volumes a handy source of quick reference. Each volume has its own index, and the matter of all four is included at the end of the final volume. Fr. Davis has also adopted the very useful method of giving a list of Canons, with a reference to those places which contain a commentary. Canon Law, in fact, has quite a large place in the treatment of the subject. There are some theologians who lament the inroads made by the Canonist on Moral Theology, or, if you like, there are some Canonists who lament the inroads of the theologian on Canon Law. But the fusion of the two is really inevitable, and an attempt, such as that made by Dr. Dumas,² to write a Moral Theology, without introducing Canon Law, results in a work which is largely shorn of practical utility. The trouble, of course, is that an exposition of Canon Law needs continual and constant revision to keep pace with new laws and interpretations. Some pages of *Addenda* at the end of Volume IV include recent decisions, published during the course of compiling the manual, and those who possess the work can easily note whatever corrections are necessary in the text of the previous volumes.

If one may say so, without appearing unreasonable or ungrateful for what the author has given us, we think that one or two points could be treated more fully to advantage. For example, the author rightly adopts the "standard of good people" and "the common opinion" as the guide in determining what is forbidden as servile work; we would like to see a more definite lead given in the direction of declaring certain occupations, such as amateur gardening, not forbidden; the common opinion of good people is anxious to tolerate such things, we think. Also, the recent discussions on the "sterile period" seem to call for a fuller treatment than is given on page 250 of Volume IV. But it is easy to make suggestions like this. The author, in covering such a multitude of subjects, has to ration his pages very carefully. The volumes are beautifully produced and printed, and the price, for such a fine work, is extremely reasonable. Fr. Davis has amply succeeded in what he set out to do—to present the common teaching of modern Catholic authors on Moral Theology.

The second volume of Fr. Loiano's manual³ brings his work nearer to completion. A work designed for confessors, and written by a theologian of much practical experience, it is to be welcomed amongst the growing ranks of the manuals since it represents the Capuchin tradition and outlook. For the rest,

² *Theologia Moralis Thomistica*. Lethielleux. 1930.

³ S.A. Loiano, O.M.Cap., *Institutiones Theologiae Moralis*. Marietti, Turin. 1935. 679 pages. 20 lire.

it does not claim to be an erudite study, but follows the general lines of the probabilist manual, successfully presenting such matters as the fasting laws in a way which makes their observance easier for the faithful.

In the more fundamental department of our subject we have a dissertation on Sins by Fr. Lumbreras, O.P., a professor at the "Angelicum."⁴ As one would expect, it is a commentary on St. Thomas, I-IIae, qq. 71-89, entirely "scholastic" in character, and its chief merit lies in the use made of parallel Thomistic passages, as well as of the works of some modern authors, in explaining the text. Fundamental Moral, which deals with Principles, is, to a large extent, simply Moral Philosophy. The well-established manual by Fr. Donat, S.J., now in its sixth edition,⁵ is considerably augmented. Another work of the same character, though not so well known, perhaps, is Fr. Elter's *Compendium Philosophiae Moralis*⁶ which has reached its second edition. It seems to us that Fr. Elter gives a fuller and more satisfactory presentation of Social Ethical Theory than most of the manualists.

A valuable collection of papers, read at the Polish Conference on Thomist Studies last year, has been printed in "Studia Gnesnensia," Vol. XII.⁷ The international character of this assembly has assured that most of the contributions are in other languages besides Polish—Latin, French, Italian and German. We notice, amongst many things of interest, papers on self-knowledge, the relation of art to morality, and the sense of mystery in St. Thomas, by the Dominican theologians RR. PP. Pelletier, Boskovic and Garrigou-Lagrange. There is also a study of marriage in the natural law by Fr. B. Lavaud, O.P., whose larger work on the subject was mentioned in these notes last May, and a number of papers dealing with social theory such as Dr. Gorski's elucidation of the Thomist doctrine concerning property. No student of St. Thomas should pass over this very fine volume of nearly 500 pages, representative of all the best exponents of Thomist doctrine.

The Report of the Joint Committees of the Convocations of Canterbury and York on "The Church and Marriage"⁸ has, in its main lines, received sufficient notice already in the Press. We will content ourselves with calling attention to some of the Appendices. Right Rev. E. A. Knox, formerly Bishop of Manchester, comments in Appendix IX on the decree *Ne Temere*, as applied to "Mixed Marriage," in which he criti-

⁴ *De Vitiis et Peccatis*, Angelicum. Rome. 1935. 202 pages.

⁵ Vol. VII, *Ethica Generalis*. Innsbruck. 1934.

⁶ Rome, Universitas Gregoriana. 1934.

⁷ *Magister Thomas Doctor Communis, Recueil des Conférences des journées internationales d'études de philosophie thomiste* (28-30 August, 1934), edited by Dr. Casimir Kowalski. Gniezno. 1935.

⁸ S.P.C.K. 2s. 6d. 115 pages.

cizes, occasionally with some warmth, what he regards as the setting up of an unnecessary conflict between Church and State. The Bishop appears to think that the Church has committed a grievous wrong and, by insisting on a certain "form," has gone back on her own teaching which used to recognize a valid marriage in the free and deliberate consent of the parties concerned. But the exact nature of his objection is puzzling. The Anglican Church requires, in addition to consent, a legal "form." Once granted that this contract is a Sacrament it is clearly the business of the Church to determine what "form" it shall take. Only the person who regarded marriage as a purely civil contract, and Bishop Knox is not of this mind, could rightly object to the "interference" of a religious authority. The Bishop has drawn his facts from a recent (1927) edition of De Smet. Chancellor H. B. Vaisey, K.C., has apparently not been so careful in drawing up a comparative list of impediments as regarded by Catholic Tribunals and by the English Courts. In giving, for example, *public decorum* arising from betrothal as an impediment which "avoids the marriage," he appears to have been using a pre-Code book. But it is difficult to guess what is meant by stating that the vow of chastity "avoids the marriage, but now practically obsolete." The list is nevertheless a most useful piece of work, because it does bring out the fact that many of our matrimonial impediments are also impediments in English Law.

We must call attention to two small works which may be of use to Diocesan Tribunals. *Normae S. Romanae Rotae Tribunalis*⁹ provides us with a lengthy and detailed collection of rules concerned with the practical working of the Rota. Dr. C. Bernardini, in his commentary on this document¹⁰ elucidates many little points which are applicable to any ecclesiastical tribunal. Dr. Benedetti, in his *Ordo Judicialis Processus Canonici Instruendi*,¹¹ has in mind solely the diocesan tribunal, and his admirable little work will certainly be of wide utility. Part III is devoted to a reprint of a complete *dossier* of a marriage case, apparently an actual case, from the Paris Tribunal in 1932. Every document is given *in extenso* from start to finish, including a copy of the evidence, in a cause of nullity arising from defective consent *contra bonum proles*.

Dictionnaire de Droit Canonique,¹² now under the direction of Dr. Naz, of Lille, is appearing with greater frequency during the last few months. We now have *Fasic. vii.* concluding with lengthy articles on Baptism in the Western and Eastern Church, by Dr. Torquebiau and Fr. Herman, S.J., respectively. Amongst the classical commentaries on the Code we are glad to welcome the second edition of Fr. Blat's work, Vol. III, *De*

⁹ A.A.S., 1934. Vol. XXVI, pp. 449-492.

¹⁰ *Leges Processuales Vigentes*, Apollinare. Rome. 1935. 94 pages.

¹¹ Marietti, Turin.

¹² Letouzey et Ané. Paris, VI.

Rebus, which incorporates all the modifications and official interpretations of the law up to April 30th, 1934.¹³

Lisbeth Burger has written a book of reminiscences covering a long life's work as a midwife in a part of Germany where the Catholic faith predominates.¹⁴ Without attempting a treatise on the Christian view of marriage, this little book does, in effect, present the subject in a most graceful and interesting manner. It contains plain and straightforward statements, without mincing words, yet is devoid of the slightest offence. It records, as the author assures us, actual facts and experiences, and all the familiar problems of divorce, mixed marriage, birth-control, abortion, the unmarried mother, etc., are presented in the course of its pages. The spread of birth control and abortion in this German community since the War makes melancholy reading, as also the growth of a cynical and material outlook on sexual relations in new Germany. But there is a ring of hope and confidence throughout, even in the most distressing cases described, and the examples portraying the beauty and charm of normal Catholic married life more than compensate for the ugly instances of abnormality and vice. With the exception, perhaps, of one statement (p. 133) put into the mouth of an otherwise admirable Catholic doctor, the book is sound Catholic Moral Theology, and it may be expected that many married people and others will learn, from the very practical and common-sense reflections of Lisbeth Burger, many lasting truths which they would not otherwise know.

III. HOLY SCRIPTURE.

BY THE VERY REV. JOHN M. T. BARTON, D.D., Lic.S.Script.

There exists in Germany a very well-known custom of producing a commemorative volume of essays on the occasion of a professorial jubilee. The contributors to the symposium are friends and admirers of the jubilarian; more often than not, they are also his colleagues and former pupils. The offering is usually connected with the jubilarian's seventieth birthday, though other jubilees are not seldom observed and the subjects chosen for the volume are ordinarily a trifle specialized, so that the recipient of the compliment can often feel that the elucidation of more than one delicate point of scholarship was intimately associated with the celebrations of his anniversary.

This custom, now common enough in this country also, is not, it would seem, frequently observed in France. When the ex-priest, Alfred Loisy, attained his seventieth birthday, the three volumes connected with the "Jubilé Alfred Loisy" were appraised in the *Revue biblique* by the subject of the present notice who commented upon the rarity of the usage in his own

¹³ Rome, Angelicum. 1934. 726 pages.

¹⁴ *Other People's Babies*. Leaves from a Midwife's Journal. Eng. Tr. Constable & Co. 1934.

country.¹ A few more years have passed since then, bringing with them two jubilees of great interest to every Catholic student of Holy Scripture. On December 22nd, 1933, Père Marie-Joseph Lagrange, O.P., the renowned Director of the Ecole biblique de S. Etienne, Jerusalem, celebrated the Golden Jubilee of his ordination to the priesthood, and, on March 7th of the present year, he reached the great age of eighty. In his case, as is only fitting, a volume of studies has appeared to mark the special solemnity of the occasion.²

It must be a matter for satisfaction that the German precedent has not, in the present instance, been followed as regards the subject matter. In place of a number of essays on disconnected subjects, the distinguished French scholars who have combined to produce this tribute to their common master, have been concerned to discuss different aspects of one great subject—the life work of Père Lagrange himself. It is not a biography in the ordinary sense; in fact, it may be questioned whether anything in the nature of a developed biography of Père Lagrange has been issued. There is, indeed, the excellent short article by Père Synave, O.P., in Bricout's *Dictionnaire pratique des connaissances religieuses*; there is also the somewhat sombre retrospect of the chronicle "Après vingt-cinq ans,"³ written by the Father at a time when the Ecole had been closed by the Turks without any immediate prospect of its being re-opened, and ending with the fine words: "L'Ecole pratique d'études bibliques a été fermée parce que française, elle renaîtra française." The latter study, though ostensibly concerned with the Ecole, tells us much with regard to the Ecole's founder and guiding spirit. Finally, there is the chapter in Lagrange's criticism of Loisy's *Memoires*, entitled *M. Loisy et le Modernisme*,⁴ which begins: "Un religieux ne doit compte de ses actes qu'à Dieu, au Saint-Père et à ses supérieurs. Si cependant on a beaucoup écrit, si son action a été jugée nefaste par des personnes pieuses, animées des meilleures intentions, il éprouvera le besoin d'expliquer sa conduite à ses frères dans la foi." This, though regrettably short, gives us at first hand the leading dates and events in Père Lagrange's long and singularly fruitful life.

The present volume is, however, primarily a study of the Father's literary activity, which has been truly prodigious. A summary of it may be found in the sympathetic and well-informed article by Père Joseph Bonsirven, S.J., in the June number of *Recherches de science religieuse*. It is, for example, difficult

¹ See *Revue biblique*, 1928, pp. 605-611, a review by Père M.-J. Lagrange, O.P.

² *L'œuvre exégétique et historique du R.P. Lagrange*, by H.E. Cardinal Liénart and others. Paris: Librairie Bloud & Gay, No. 28 of the "Cahiers de la Nouvelle Journée," 1935. pp. 232. Price 24 francs.

³ *Revue biblique*, 1915, pp. 248-261.

⁴ Juvisy (Editions du Cerf), 1932, Ch. III, "M. Loisy et la *Revue biblique*," pp. 68-86. See CLERGY REVIEW, Vol. V, pp. 155-56.

to realize that, out of the thirty-eight volumes of the *Etudes bibliques*, a series initiated by Père Lagrange in the year 1900, no less than fifteen have come from the Father's own pen. It is of this series that Cardinal Liénart writes in his preface to the volume: "Certainement la collection des *Etudes bibliques* constitue l'ensemble le plus complet et, pour ainsi dire, la 'Somme' de l'enseignement scripturaire à notre époque." And, even when one has remembered the published books, one has left out of account the countless articles on every sort of subject in the *Revue biblique*, the *Revue thomiste*, *Le Correspondant* and many other periodicals. It is one of the merits of the jubilee volume that it gives references to many of these occasional contributions. And, when reckoning is made of the many months spent in journeying through the lands of the Near East, the long hours passed in teaching, the service of the choir, and the inexhaustible willingness to assist others in their labours, it will be seen that only a very well-organized life could have produced so much of the highest quality.

The volume under review is much more than a bare summary of titles and contents. It is, in effect, a fairly complete history of Catholic exegesis during the last half-century and of the problems of scriptural interpretation, whether these have already been solved or are still awaiting a definitive solution. M. Joseph Chaîne, Professor of New Testament exegesis at the Catholic faculty of Lyons, covers a wide field in the first essay on "L'Ancien Testament, Le Sémitisme." In his discussion of Père Lagrange's views on Biblical Inspiration, he is able to show the strength and sanity of the great Dominican's approach to the various issues; in his second section, "L'Oeuvre de Moïse," he considers, first, literary criticism, and then historical criticism. Apropos of the latter, he includes an account of Lagrange's writings on the early narratives of Genesis, primitive and patriarchal history, the Mosaic legislation, and the geography of Israel's journeyings in the wilderness. The third section of M. Chaîne's essay is, it seems to me, all too brief. One cannot, in less than four pages, do justice to three such works as the *Etudes sur les religions sémitiques* (which, published in the second edition in 1905, is still the most indispensable work on Semitic religions); *Le messianisme chez les Juifs* (1908); and *Le Judaïsme avant Jésus-Christ* (1931).

In the second essay "Le Nouveau Testament et les origines chrétiennes," M. Venard, well known for his work in the *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique*,⁵ gives some account of the great commentaries on the Gospels, the *Synopsis evangelica* (1926), *L'Evangile de Jésus-Christ* (1928), and the editions of Romans (1916) and Galatians (1918). "Le milieu hellénique" is ably handled by M. Gustave Bardy, the eminent patrologist, in sections dealing with Lagrange's studies of ancient Crete,

⁵ For particulars, see the bibliography at the end of No. 20 in the C.T.S. *Studies in Comparative Religion*, p. 36.

the Logos doctrine, Epictetus and Marcus Aurelius, the religion of the Greek philosophers, St. Justin, Philo of Alexandria, and the Hermetic writings. In the fourth place comes an appreciation of Lagrange's treatment of comparative religion by M. E. Magnin, which seeks to determine the value of the Father's writings on the mystery religions, Persian religion, and Mandaicism.

The volume ends with a more personal document "L'influence du R. P. Lagrange, un témoignage," by M. J. Guittou, offered to the Father as a token of gratitude "pour un service primordial rendu à plusieurs universitaires chrétiens, qui avaient été (ou qui auraient pu être) écartés de la foi par la critique biblique." It has been the glorious privilege of Père Lagrange to have been, under God, the means of safeguarding the faith of many. Of all his great works, the outcome of his fine, simple and devout nature, this is indeed the greatest. Those of us who have been his students, who are united by the bond of unflinching devotion to the most lovable of masters, are proud to recognize this. "Qui ad justitiam erudiunt multos, fulgebunt quasi stellae in perpetuas aeternitates."

This jubilee of a great man was preceded, at less than a year's distance in time, by the jubilee of a great institution. On the 7th of May, 1909, the Pontifical Biblical Institute, so well known to all visitors to its home and library in the Piazza Pilotta in Rome, and to all readers of its scholarly publications, was founded by His Holiness Pope Pius X in the Apostolic Letter "Vinea electa." Last year it celebrated the Silver Jubilee of its foundation and the event has been commemorated by the production of two fine volumes of *Miscellanea Biblica*.⁶ There are, in all, thirty articles, distributed between the two volumes in the proportion of thirteen and seventeen, and most of them are studies of some length and of definite importance as contributions to knowledge. In all, six languages have been employed in the composition of the articles—Latin, English, French, German, Italian, and Spanish. It is, unfortunately, quite impossible to give here any real clue to the richness and variety of the contents. The list of articles alone would fill about a page of this REVIEW. Perhaps for the general reader the most interesting of all is that by the present Rector of the Institute, P. Augustinus Bea, S.J., which forms the introduction to the series. It is entitled: "Pontificii Instituti Biblici de Urbe Prima Quinque Lustra." It gives very clearly and with many interesting details the origin and history of the Institute; the order and progress of the studies; the former or existing rectors and professors; the students who have followed the courses; the writings that have been produced by members of the Institute; the various helps provided by it for

⁶ Edita a Pontificio Instituto Biblico ad celebrandum annum XXV ex quo conditum est Institutum. Rome, Piazza della Pilotta, 35. Vol. I, pp. 316. Price 20 lire. Vol. II, pp. 406. Price 30 lire.

obtaining a better knowledge of Biblical matters (among these is rightly mentioned, in the first place, its magnificent library); and, last of all, the daughter-house of the Institute at Jerusalem.

Among the other articles the reader may remark one in English by Fr. Edmund Sutcliffe of Heythrop: "Primeval Chaos Not Scriptural," in which the writer proves that the conception of a primitive chaos is not well-grounded in the texts and that the words "tohu wabohu" of Genesis i. 2 is not, as S. R. Driver claimed "an alliterative description of a *chaos* in which nothing can be distinguished or defined," but a description of the earth as "waste" because it had not yet received its clothing of vegetation and "empty," "because it was as yet entirely without those beings that people it and move about upon its surface" (p. 209). Attention should also be called to Padre Vaccari's masterly discussion of the Servant songs in Isaias, to Père Bonsirven's study in sin and expiation in the theology of Palestinian Judaism at the time of Christ, and to the long illustrated article on "La question des images chez les Juifs à la lumière des récentes découvertes" by the learned Secretary of the Pontifical Biblical Commission, Père Jean-Baptiste Frey, C.S.Sp. These are only a few indications. Where so much is provided and of so fine a vintage, the discriminating reader will study his own palate.

The house of Letouzey et Ané has recently undertaken yet another major work of erudition in addition to the great dictionaries, the history of the councils, and other publications. This is a twelve-volume commentary on the Bible which is, no doubt, designed to be a much improved successor to the late Abbé Fillion's "La Sainte Bible commentée." The general editor is M. le Chanoine Louis Pirot, the recently appointed French consultor of the Biblical Commission, but, as the publisher's announcement frankly recognizes: "Le temps n'est plus où un seul auteur pouvait entreprendre seul une pareille œuvre et la mener à terme dans de bonnes conditions." Hence, it is to be the work not of one or two but of many, and the editor has enlisted the services of most of the better-known exegetes among the French and Belgian clergy. One may mention MM. Tricot and Robert of Paris; M. Chainé of Lyons; M. Dennefeld of Strasbourg; M. Coppens and Père Braun, O.P., of Louvain; M. Bardy of Dijon; and Père Médebielle, S.C.J., of Nazareth.

The plan of the volumes is well-conceived. It aims at giving, on the head of each page, the text of the Sixto-Clementine Vulgate, divided by paragraphs and not by verses. Underneath, in somewhat larger type, is a French translation, not of the Vulgate, but of the original texts (Hebrew, Greek or Aramaic). Beneath these are occasionally to be found a few notes on variant readings; it is expected that there should be as few of these as possible. Finally, the greater part of each page is occupied by a commentary, which is intended (a) to explain the literal sense of the original, without losing sight of the

typical sense where it exists, and to bring out the importance of the theological and apologetic content; (b) to give such lexicographical, grammatical, historical and geographical indications as may seem necessary; (c) to provide in the case of many passages (e.g., the Gospel parables, the Psalms and the Prophets) helps towards a fruitful use of Holy Scripture in preaching.

The only volume that has, so far, come to hand is Tome IX *Les Saints Evangiles: S. Matthieu-S. Marc.*⁷ As was to be expected, it is a highly condensed but valuable treatment of the first two Gospels. The commentary is printed in clear but extremely small type; this and the arrangement in two columns cannot be said to stimulate protracted reading, but, wherever I have taken samples I have found them of excellent quality. So, for example, the discussion of the Petrine text, Matthew xvi. 13-16, is a convenient summary of what is treated much more fully in Père Médebielle's article *Eglise* in the *Supplément au Dictionnaire de la Bible*, which is also edited by M. Pirot.

In *History and Interpretation in the Gospels*,⁸ which is the Bampton Lectures for 1934, Mr. R. H. Lightfoot has not, he tells us, found it possible "to give equal consideration to each of the four gospels." It was his original intention, but he came to realize that he could not complete such a task satisfactorily within the limits of the lectures. Hence, he has given the lion's share of the space to a consideration of St. Mark's Gospel. His opening chapter is an interesting, though, in my view, highly selective, account of "The Study of the Gospels until the present time," in which the two principal names that occur and recur are those of Wrede and Wellhausen. With the exception of Lord Acton, who is incidentally mentioned on p. 11, no Catholic scholar of recent time (unless one should include Dante, p. 176) appears to be deemed worthy of quotation or reference. In the second chapter, headed "Formgeschichte," the author shows his ready acceptance of the method of form-criticism, which is still, as he regretfully records, viewed with so much suspicion in England. It has been pointed out already in these columns⁹ that the essential defect of the Method lies not in its identification of various literary forms (Passion-narratives, miracle stories, sayings and parables) in the Gospels, but in its attempt to prove that the Gospels originally consisted of fragments in free circulation and that these fragments were, in great part, the creation of the primitive community. Mr. Lightfoot seems to be all too little aware of the corrosive element in the Method, and the remainder of his book (which, it must be allowed, contains many details of interest) loses

⁷ St. Matthew, by Père Denis Buzy, S.C.J.; St. Mark, by M. le Chanoine Pirot. Paris, Letouzey & Ané. 1935. pp. 612, with five maps or plans. Subscription price is 600 francs for the twelve volumes; a deposit of 100 francs is obligatory.

⁸ London, Hodder & Stoughton. 1935. pp. xvii.+236. Price, 10s. 6d.

⁹ See CLERGY REVIEW, Vol. V, pp. 316-317.

much of its effectiveness because it rests upon so insecure a foundation.¹⁰

The Bible and the Greeks by Dr. C. H. Dodd¹¹ does not quite justify its title, which would suggest something more akin to Père A. J. Festugière's *L'Idéal Religieux des Grecs et l'Evangile*.¹² It is, in effect, a discussion, first, of the religious vocabulary of Hellenistic Judaism (which involves a really excellent analysis of many terms in the Hebrew Bible and their Septuagintal equivalents); and, secondly, a somewhat overlong section on Hellenistic Judaism and the Hermetic writings. The value of the *Corpus Hermeticum* may readily be exaggerated and, as regards its alleged influence on Christianity, Père Lagrange concludes his survey: "Concluons donc à propos de l'hermétisme qu'on a fait beaucoup de bruit pour rien."¹³ It is a pity that these articles do not appear to have been studied by Dr. Dodd. His concern is, it is true, rather with the influence of Judaism upon the Hermetica, but he might have spared some pages for a treatment of the more vital issue.

¹⁰ Students of the Synoptic problem will read with attention the note to pp. 27-28 apropos of the origin of the term Q. It was, it would seem, first used by the late Dr. Armitage Robinson, and it did *not* stand for the German "Quelle" (source), but simply for the next letter after P (=the Petrine material, i.e., St. Mark).

¹¹ Hodder & Stoughton. 1935. pp. xv.+264. Price, 10s. 6d.

¹² See CLERGY REVIEW, Vol. V, pp. 314-315.

¹³ *Revue biblique*, 1926, pp. 262-264. See M. Bardy's discussion in *L'œuvre exégétique et historique du R.P. Lagrange*, pp. 154-161.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

DISPENSATION "AD CAUTELAM."

A dispensation is obtained from the Diocesan Curia from the impediment of "Mixed Religion" and, since the validity of the non-Catholic baptism was doubtful, the document contained in addition the words "etiam, ad cautelam, super disparitate cultus." Before the dispensation was executed, by the priest who applied for it, it transpires beyond all doubt that the person was not baptized. Is it necessary to apply again for a dispensation from the impediment of "difference of worship"? (X.)

REPLY.

Dispensation from impediments obtained from a diocesan Curia, by virtue of faculties granted to them by the Apostolic See, are usually issued *in forma gratiosa*; that is to say, the impediment is dispensed at the moment the document is issued. What the priest does is not to execute the dispensation but merely to acquaint the parties of the fact that the dispensation has been granted.

Canon 15: "Leges, etiam irritantes et inhabilitantes, in dubio juris non urgent; in dubio autem facti potest Ordinarius in eis dispensare, dummodo agatur de legibus in quibus Romanus Pontifex dispenare solet." Cf. also Canon 81.

Canon 209: "In errore communi aut in dubio positivo et probabili sive juris sive facti, jurisdictionem supplet Ecclesia pro foro tum externo tum interno."

Facultates additionales S. Cong. S. Officii (A) "i. Dispensandi, justis gravibusque accedentibus causis, cum subditis etiam extra territorium, aut non subditis intra limites proprii territorii, super impedimento mixtae religionis, et, si casus ferat, etiam super disparitate cultus, ad cautelam. . . ii. Dispensandi, justis gravibusque accedentibus causis, cum subditis etiam extra territorium, aut non subditis infra limites proprii territorii, super impedimento disparitatis cultus (excepto tamen casu matrimonii cum parte judaica aut mahumentana). . ."

It is evident that the formula issued for "Mixed Religion," containing also *ad cautelam* "Difference of Worship," will not suffice for a case which is certainly Difference of Worship, and known so to be at the time. The dispensing authority would require graver reasons for the latter, and the two are kept quite distinct in the additional quinquennial faculties usually granted to Ordinaries. But, if the dispensation is properly granted, in a case of doubtful baptism, with the formula "ad cautelam," the subsequent marriage is most certainly valid, even though it is discovered that *de facto* the non-Catholic was not baptized. In other words, for the validity of the marriage, no further dispensation is required. The situation is amply covered by the wording of the quinquennial faculties, and even without these

faculties it is covered by Canon 15, not to mention the "supplied jurisdiction" of Canon 209. "In cases of doubt of fact, the Ordinary may dispense, that is, the Ordinary is always empowered to dispense, at least *ad cautelam*, though a dispensation may not always be required. A dispensation is undoubtedly required in a *dubium facti* concerning a matrimonial impediment. For the law of the impediment being an invalidating law, strictly speaking obtains, and if later the existence of the impediment is really established, the Church regards such a marriage as invalid. . . ." Thus writes Cicognani on Canon 15.¹ Later on in this treatise, commenting on Canon 82, he writes, "However, when, for example, the matter concerns a doubtful diriment matrimonial impediment, which becomes certain later on, the marriage should be regarded as valid if the Bishop dispensed, otherwise invalid" (p. 843).

E. J. M.

FASTING.

Would it be a correct interpretation of the law, on a day of fasting without abstinence, to allow a small quantity of meat food at other refectations as well as at the chief meal? (C.)

REPLY.

Canon 1251, §1: "*Lex ieiunii praescribit ut nonnisi unica per diem comestio fiat; sed non vetat aliquid cibi mane et vespere sumere, servata tamen circa ciborum quantitatem et qualitatem probata locorum consuetudine.*" §2: "*Nec vetitum est carnes ac pisces in eadem refectatione permiscere; nec serotinam refectationem cum prandio permutare.*"

The suggested interpretation is certainly possible from the text of the law as contained in the Code, but one must take into account "custom" in determining what is permitted at the light refectations. There has been a movement during the last few years to make fasting easier by rejecting a too rigid computation of the quantity permitted, at these light refectations. The "two ounces" for the *frustulum* and the "eight ounces" for the *collatio* may no longer be regarded as a flat rule unless it is the established custom of a given district. But, as regards the quality of the food permitted, meat and its derivatives have always been excluded by most of the authors who are either interpreting the law or explaining to us the customs of certain districts. Immediately after the appearance of the Code, certain writers deduced from the above Canon that meat could be taken more than once a day, on days of fasting without abstinence. Cardinal Gasparri, the President of the Commission for interpreting the Code, decided, October 29th, 1919, that this interpretation was incorrect. The reason, of course, is that the essence of the fast is one full meal, the other two refectations being allowed in order that one may take just sufficient *light* nourishment to enable one to observe the fast.

E. J. M.

¹ Canon Law, Eng. Tr., p. 589.

BOOK REVIEWS

Charles I and the Court of Rome. By Gordon Albion, D.Sc.Hist.
(Burns Oates & Washbourne. pp. xxxix., 451, 7 illus.
15s.)

Just a hundred years after Henry VIII was forcing his subjects to renounce the Pope's authority, some Scots laymen, claiming the Queen's encouragement, carried to Rome the expectation of the recovery of this island by the Church through the conversion of its king. "The interest in theology, though dislike of polemics" of Charles I was said to offer "genuine hope of his conversion," and it was urged that he would be drawn nearer to the Church if one of his subjects (a fellow Scot, George Con, was indicated) were made a Cardinal, while by the same means the divided English Catholics would be rallied. Cardinal del Bagno, Bishop of Cervia, had recently been for nine years nuncio at Brussels and Paris, and was well able to advise on the project. While hesitating between conscious deception and groundless credulity in regard to those moving it, he surmised that in as far as the King desired an understanding with Rome, the purpose was to obtain Papal support for the restoration of the Palatinate to his sister and her children. Charles, he considered, "lacking in learning, dull and not to be convinced by reason; moreover, being extremely timorous, he was unlikely to take a step that politically would be highly hazardous for him." But to show too little credit would be unworthy, and this might prove the providential beginning of better things. In the result Panzani was sent to England to find a remedy for the dissension of the Catholics and to pave the way for an exchange of Residents between the Pope and the Queen. Two years later, George Con, a layman who held a canonry at St. Lorenzo in Damaso and had been for some years of the household of the Secretary of State, Cardinal Barberini, came over as Papal Agent to Henrietta Maria, and Sir William Hamilton was sent to represent her in Rome. Con was replaced after three years by Count Rossetti, until the position became untenable in the days of the Long Parliament, and he was forced to leave the country in 1641. Hamilton, irked by the cautiousness and delays of the Romans, had obtained his recall a year earlier and left his secretary in charge of the Queen's interests.

Dr. Albion disclaims any "endeavour to deal with the history of the Catholic Church in England" during the period, his object being "a study of seventeenth century diplomacy," giving an almost day to day record of the negotiations by close adherence to the Barberini correspondence. He gives completeness to his work by considering in detail the earlier contact of Charles with the Holy See at the time of the abortive Spanish Marriage treaty and the French Match, and carries the history

down to the Papal efforts in aid of the Irish revolt of 1645. The movement in this country that was to end in revolution is scarcely in evidence, since the correspondents seem to have been unaware of, or to have disregarded the growing strength of the forces adverse to their aims. What they neglect might well have been indicated in the general introduction. The author has done a service to any who will attempt the history of the English Catholics by making generally available what has hitherto been confined to archives; there is a good index and a full bibliography. When that desirable, but difficult, task is accomplished, it is likely to appear that the absence of an Ordinary rather than "the Oath of Allegiance was at the root of all the troubles of the Catholics, both among themselves and with the Government," at this period. That oath had been devised, after the gunpowder plot, to divide and disgrace the Catholics by throwing doubt upon their loyalty, and had succeeded in both objects. But thirty years later, "there can be little doubt that Charles I wanted merely civil allegiance, and had no desire to invade the Pope's spiritual power," and with Con's aid he set to work to devise a formula that would meet the position, and this was approved by both the Vice-provincial of the Jesuits and George Musket representing the secular clergy. But the controversy was too alive to be quietly side-tracked, and the Roman theologians found the proposed oath too like the original one. The alternative suggested by Barberini paid no regard to the conditions in England created, for instance, by the annually repeated service of thanksgiving for delivery from Gunpowder Treason, and Hamilton "did not hesitate to tell him that if there had been a bishop in England with whom the Oath could have been adjusted, all would have been well." The event justified his words, for when, 150 years later, the first measure of relief did come to Catholics in Ireland, and then in England, it was conditioned by an oath which, while omitting the obnoxious terms, renounced the deposing power and abjured the temporal and civil jurisdiction of the Pope, direct and indirect, within the realm.

Bishop Smith's troubles with the Government were not of his making, and within three years the Queen was disposed to ask for his recall to England. Charles, influenced by Laud, afterwards refused to admit "the setting up of any foreign jurisdiction within the jurisdiction of the Church of England, which will be continually fighting one with the other." The creation of a native Cardinal, now warmly advocated by the Queen as a solution of the difficulties of the Catholics, was at first welcomed by Charles as a possible means of bringing direct influence to bear on the Pope and the Catholic powers in his sister's interest. But Rome would not trust Charles as a Protestant, and in the signal service of his conversion Con failed. Half a century of stress and storm elapsed before those who did not fall short in either loyalty caught another passing glimpse of the calm they had experienced during these few years.

J. L. WHITFIELD.

Anglicanism, The Thought and Practice of the Church of England, illustrated from the Religious Literature of the Seventeenth Century. Compiled and edited by Paul Elmer More and Frank Leslie Cross. (S.P.C.K. pp. lxxvi. and 812. 21s.)

This notable book, beautifully printed and produced, is indispensable for the study of Anglicanism. It is a book of sources, in which you see Anglicanism in the making and newly made. The period covered ranges from 1594, when Hooker published the first four volumes of his *Ecclesiastical Polity*, to 1691, the schism of the Non-Jurors. The scope of the book is indicated in the Preface. It is "to make a collection of passages from the ecclesiastical writers of the Seventeenth Century which would set forth the doctrine and discipline—what might be called in a broad sense the genius—of the Church of England in that age of adjustment after the first confusions of the Reformation." The quotations selected are so arranged as to embrace all the greater questions of theology. Each quotation is preceded, where necessary, by a short account of the work whence it is taken; and at the end of the book there is a list of biographies in outline.

Mr. Paul Elmer More, one of the compilers, and Mr. F. R. Arnott, of Keble College, Oxford, introduce the subject-matter with two essays, the one on *The Spirit of Anglicanism*, the other on *Anglicanism in the Seventeenth Century*. "Diversity of opinion and diffusion of authority are patent on the surface of Caroline literature," writes Mr. More. He gives as the reason for this that England has never produced a theologian to whom appeal can be made for a final solution, as the Germans appeal to Luther and the Presbyterians to Calvin; and there is no ultimate court such as the Council of Trent. But he finds an underlying unity of doctrine in Anglicanism beneath the superficial diversity. Both writers agree that the character of Anglicanism is a kind of liberal Catholicism, a religion that takes its stand firmly on Sacred Scripture and ancient Tradition but has assimilated the best elements of the Reformation. It is thus a *via media* between Rome and radical Protestantism. Its function is rather to point a direction than to issue a verdict.

Such an optimistic view of Anglicanism is, of course, familiar. It expresses with sufficient accuracy the image of the Church of England that was forged in the controversies of the seventeenth century. But the specific character of the *via media* is negative; its positive elements are an illogical collocation of Catholic and Protestant tenets. Hence it is not surprising that with the passage of the centuries the badly cohering system should have shown signs of deep and wide disintegration that no external patching can conceal. Did not the late Bishop Gore write: "The Anglican Church, at least in England, is in grievous danger, because it can no longer plausibly explain to the world or its own members what it stands for?" Yet it is Bishop Gore and his fellow essayists in *Lux Mundi* rather than Newman in

his *Prophetical Office*, who, in Mr. More's opinion, preserves the straight continuity of direction with the Caroline divines. Those who, like Mr. More, keep up a rosy outlook on Anglicanism, may rejoice that, after reading *Lux Mundi*, they "breathe again that air of larger freedom which frightened Newman into the prison-house of absolutism." But the world, and England, and many Church members are still waiting for the plausible explanation.

J. CARTMELL.

Les Exercices pratiques du "Séminaire" en Théologie. By the Rev. J. de Ghellinck, S.J. (Desclée de Brouwer et Cie., Paris. pp. xiv., 223. 20 francs. Ed. 2, 1935.)

Reflecting upon the theory and practice of the new papal scheme of studies for seminaries, the adoption of which is rewarded with the power to confer degrees, one finds oneself coming with no little conviction to the conclusion that the biggest thing about it is the *Seminar*. The word has come to us from Germany, along with the institution, which is well established in some (perhaps all) of our universities. The student is to be trained to work for himself, to study and criticize sources, to get more or less to the bottom of some question or other that lends itself to the purpose, to collaborate with others under the professor's guidance in producing something that may prove a real contribution to knowledge. The papal scheme establishes a model and ideal even for the institutions which do not adopt it; and it is the introduction of the *Seminar* which perhaps more than anything else will be found to inaugurate a new era and a new spirit in our ecclesiastical training. Some will probably be puzzled by the practical problems that arise in attempting to found and work a *Seminar*; and for such the present little volume will be found of great practical value. Père de Ghellinck has taught at the Gregorian University as well as at the large college of higher studies of the Belgian province of the Society at Louvain; his vast learning is widely recognized, and again and again in this little volume he shows himself the practical teacher, well able to use his long experience. He has tried to write a really helpful book for practical purposes, and one may prophesy with some confidence that the more his advice is carried out (not, of course, blindly, but after careful consideration), the higher the intellectual standard will rise in the training of the Catholic priesthood.

C. L.

Francis Thompson. By Federico Olivero. (Morcelliana, Brescia. 20 lire.)

Just as it is incontrovertible that Francis Thompson is "a true poet, one of the small band," to quote Meredith's own words about him, so is it certain that he will never be a "popular" poet. This must not be taken as arguing some imperfection in his make-up as a poet, for the art of the poet is something objective and independent of popular applause.

Thompson's lofty, and profoundly religious ideas will appeal to a limited audience only, and his language and concise expression will always make him difficult. Professor Olivero shows himself to be one of that limited audience. As a Catholic he is better equipped to understand Thompson's intensely Catholic spirit than the majority of Thompson's own countrymen, but he has also triumphed over the poet's difficulty of language. In this book, limited to 350 copies, he has produced an excellent critical study of Francis Thompson. He begins with a short account of the brief but strange life of this poet and mystic. The rest of the book is devoted to the poet's religious thought, his treatment of Nature, his theory of Poetry, his Imagery, his Style, his Language, his Metre, his Sources, and his conception of Life and Art. Each of these points form a separate chapter of the book, and Professor Olivero, besides bringing numerous quotations from the poet himself to bear on the subject, shows himself thoroughly conversant with contemporary literature—in fact, he has written numerous books on English literature.

The appearance of this book seems to indicate that Francis Thompson has his audience also in Italy, nor is there anything surprising in that, for the true poet knows no confines of nationality. If at any time Francis Thompson were set as the subject of an examination, this would be an excellent text-book for the purpose, in fact an indispensable one; but it is also recommended to all who wish for a really excellent critical analysis of the poet. In conclusion one may hope that this book will find a translation into English.

L. W.

The Place Names of the Roman Breviary in Latin and English.

By the Rev. F. J. Pinkman. (From the author, The Presbytery, New Milton, Hants; or Messrs. Burns Oates & Washbourne. pp. 24. Wrapper 6d.; post free 7½d.)

Much painstaking work has gone to the compilation of this small book in which Father Pinkman identifies the place-names of the breviary. How many of us, I wonder, recognize Aix-la-Chapelle in *Aquisgranum* and Aix-les-Bains in *Aquæ Sextiæ*, or discriminate between these and the four other *Aquæ* to be met with in the breviary? Wisely the compiler has scrutinized even modern Offices and diocesan Supplements, and can surprise us with such names as *Cadomum* or *Cataracta* or *Girvum*. We learn to know the Channel Islands as *Cæsaria*, *Sarnia* (*Riduna*?) and *Sargium*. Even a few un-Latinized names are inserted where a topographical note is considered useful. Altogether we have here a handy guide to a better local understanding of the breviary lessons.

A. BENTLEY.

THE CHURCH AT HOME AND ABROAD

I. ROME.

BY THE VERY REV. MGR. R. L. SMITH, Ph.D., M.A.

I am writing in the hills, with the Papal Villa, now boasting two observatory domes, staring at me across Lake Albano, and down in the plain Rome dancing in the heat. This looking down on the City from a height seems to suggest that one should be able to get away from the events of the past month and see them grouped together, at last in an intelligible compass. But can one? They are still so near. Mr. Eden, for instance, has been and gone. But you know all about that. As a result of newspaper polemics and Sir Samuel Hoare's speech in the Commons, we now know that the British offer in this Abyssinian business did credit to our hearts if not quite so much to our heads. Actually it set Rome and Paris by the ears. After the declaration of London in February and the Stresa Conference, here was perfidious Albion acting on her own initiative, concluding a naval treaty with Germany without French and Italian approval, and playing the rôle of peace-maker, with singular clumsiness, where no one had asked her to interfere. So naturally she got the usual reward of the peace-maker, and has now subsided hurt. That is the version of the foreign political news-writer, but, of course, it is neither the whole truth nor completely just.

The naval treaty has not worried Italy as it has worried France. Mussolini is always a realist, and approves of seizing golden opportunities. Nor are his interests in the Baltic and the North Sea of an immediate importance. So he could forgive British opportunism, if it did not mean any break in the united front established by Stresa and the subsequent reproof of Germany voted at Geneva. France was definitely disturbed by any increase in German armaments, whether by land or sea. And when this was negotiated by her ally, where were her famous securities, and of what worth was Stresa? It is to preserve a united front for her own sake, as against Germany, that she is prepared to give Italy a free hand in Abyssinia. But the re-emergence of Germany as a naval power in the North Sea is an obvious threat to her own coasts, and another step towards the situation in 1914. Consequently Monsieur Laval was very short with Mr. Eden, and England was the villain in the piece, with her desertion of Stresa as her formal sin, though the material crime lay elsewhere and proved different for France and for Italy.

In this latter case, quite a furore has been worked up against Britain for trying to offer Abyssinia a sea-port, and so facilitate her importation of arms and munitions of war. In the circumstances that must be interpreted as an anti-Italian move, and

Mussolini rejected it on the spot. It is unnecessary to look for ulterior motives as the whole Italian Press has done. But now that the offer is withdrawn the tone of the Press has changed from anger to pitying contempt, and is content to look for better things from the new régime at the Foreign Office, finding it convenient to saddle Sir John Simon with most of the responsibility for British shilly-shallying—with what justice I hardly see.

But it is important that we should realize that the offer Mr. Eden was authorized to make in Rome showed a lamentable misunderstanding of the whole situation. Italy is determined to settle the Abyssinian question once and for all. There have been bickerings between the two powers for a quarter of a century or more. Her colonies are quite inadequate for Italy's needs—she had some nine million citizens working abroad under other flags—and having a just quarrel, as she feels, with the backward and barbarous administration of Abyssinia, here is a splendid opportunity of getting a new sphere of influence, where Italians can work either under their own flag (that means conquest), or at least under their own government (and that means a mandate). Which is Mussolini's intention I cannot pretend to guess; it may depend on circumstances. But nothing less than one or the other will satisfy the Fascist régime. They are pouring men into the country and spending money like water. It is quite beside the question to satisfy them with any relatively small and unprofitable tract of territory. If we had offered them the whole of Kenya, it would have shown some appreciation of the situation—though it was impossible from our point of view. But anything less means that we do not believe the evidence of our eyes. Italy is serious and some sort of war is inevitable. We may regret it: I certainly do, because war, like all sparks, is apt to start a conflagration. But we must face facts, and the only possible negotiated settlement, whether at Geneva or the Hague, must give Italy the power of protecting the interests of a vast number of colonists in Abyssinia. And how is that to be done short of a mandate?

The trouble is that Germany and Japan, to mention only two other countries, may take the same line. Germany has already done so in several speeches from her ministers. And Britain possesses more of the world's surface than any other country. Mussolini would prefer to settle these questions by negotiation—he is not a mere fire-eater, as some ignorant newspapers try to make out. He has always held that no treaty can stand which contradicts the evidence of facts. That was why he was in favour of the revision of Versailles, but the Little Entente took fright at the very word and dragged a not unwilling France with them. And so Germany broke her bonds, and now we are faced with the Nazis. But if it is asked why Mussolini does not practise his own preaching in this case, his answer is simple: that the country with which he is dealing makes it impossible. It has never yet kept its word, in Italian

experience. It is a slave-trading country and a barbarous people. Every argument that justified England and France in seizing and holding large tracts of Africa, justifies Italy now in removing the scandal of the Ethiopian kingdom, and taking the reward of her labours. It is the old argument of the have-nots against the haves. Unfortunately, there will always be some have-nots. But the Duce would probably answer that if they are civilized powers, then one can come to a peaceful settlement with them. Let us hope so. Meanwhile, everyone expects war in September, when the "season" may be said to have started. Something dramatic and fundamental must intervene before then if war is to be staved off. And no one quite sees what it can be.

As for the credit of the League of Nations—well, it has not got much. Writers have not failed to point out that the plums have all gone to those who deserted the League: Japan and Germany, not to those who have remained in it. And Italy is still in. She would probably subscribe to the view that the League should confine itself to Europe. To enlarge its scope to cover the whole world is to put civilized and barbaric countries on the same footing; and Italy has plenty of experience in Abyssinia of the futility of that situation. Actually, England objected to Abyssinia's admittance into the League on these very grounds. That we are now prepared to intervene on her behalf shows our devotion to the League. And France, with less honour, is being quite as inconsistent, since she sponsored Abyssinia at Geneva. We have only to ask ourselves what we really think about the sovereign rights of, say, Liberia, to see what an Italian thinks of the sovereign rights of Abyssinia. I know that many experts hold the Ethiopian Emperor to be perfectly sincere in his efforts to get rid of slavery, and to agree with him that anything drastic would only lead to revolution. But there is another point of view: namely, that in that case it would be better for civilization to put someone in the place of the Negus who would be strong enough to put the slave-trade down at once. And Italy is prepared to take the responsibility.

So, while Rome shimmers in the plain, great events are shaping themselves over the face of the world. Germany is becoming a blacker spot every day, and it seems impossible to hope that conflict will not break out openly between the Nazis and Catholicism. On the other hand, there were many in the Vatican who seemed quite optimistic about Mexico when Calles was driven from office. The President's declaration that all the laws against the Church would be rigorously administered has not yet silenced this hope for better things. It is said to be a political move, and that we must wait patiently for the politician to prepare the ground: that there will be no sudden *volte-face*, but a series of ameliorating decrees, such as the permission of religious journalism, which will yet prove in the mass to be a veritable *volte-face*. In Spain, too, hopes are high,

and with the revision of the Constitution everyone expects a *modus vivendi* with the Vatican, if not a complete concordat. It may be too soon for that yet: but, they say, it will come. There are even rumours that persecution will gradually die out in Russia, and that then there will be a great chance for Catholicism, if only we have the men to take advantage of it. To this end quite a few Latins are transferring to the Greek rite: theirs is an heroic mission. But what are so few amid the vast spaces of Russia?

Meanwhile, the Pope goes quietly on. Despite all these alarms and excursions he is building up the missions, establishing a native clergy, calling the laymen to Catholic action, and generally clearing the decks for a great struggle. But without any fuss at all. I have been immensely impressed this year with his calm. There was only the one outburst against war—but Catholicism is already at the outposts. In Austria the Faith is holding a divided country together; in the Balkans she is fighting to preserve peace among races who have gained little or nothing from the suppression of the Hapsburgs; in Germany we are at zero hour, and should Catholicism fall, we shall witness the appalling sight of a Christian nation officially returning to paganism, a warning, surely, of the coming of anti-Christ; in Poland, too, it is the Faith which has confronted Bolshevism for years; in the East, we must convert China and Japan, or someday the Yellow Peril will submerge us—there will be no need of war: the declining birth-rate in Europe will see to that; the Negro problem in the United States could be largely solved by the Catholicizing of the blacks; the Moslem danger in Africa can be met no other way; even the Irish question would yield if England repossessed itself of its Catholic mentality, as the Roman question died when Italy returned officially to the Faith of her fathers.

I have recently met a most interesting man who has travelled the whole world and who, though he has no religious sympathy with the Faith, is politically an ardent Roman. He sees no salvation for civilization unless it return to all the things for which the Faith stands. It makes it all the more impressive that he has not the slightest idea why the Faith should stand for these things. But everywhere he has been he has seen constructive sanity in the Catholic outlook, and in the Catholic outlook alone. And all hyperbole apart, what is the alternative? Nordic paganism, Russian bolshevism, a middle Asia of militant Mohammedanism, and the Far East under Japanese materialism? The answer to all this is Catholic action, the life of prayer and good works of every Catholic, whether priest or layman. The Holy Father has literally proclaimed a crusade for the salvation, not only of our own souls, but of the structure of the civilized world. Whosoever hears his voice, besides being a true Catholic, is a good European. And it is heartening to know that even in the twentieth century the crusader is not yet dead.

II. FRANCE.

BY DENIS GWYNN, D.Litt.

The Fête Nationale of July 14th passed off without any violent collision in Paris, but afforded an opportunity to the organizations on both sides to demonstrate their strength. The rival demonstrations were held at opposite sides of the city; the Radicals and Socialists and Communists joining forces in the Place de la Nation, in the heart of the working class quarters, while the Croix de Feu and the similar organizations paraded in the afternoon in the "West End," before going to perform their patriotic tribute at the tomb of the Unknown Soldier beneath the Arc de Triomphe. Unquestionably the Left produced a much more numerous and impressive parade (estimated at some 200,000) whereas Colonel de la Rocque and his Croix de Feu led a much smaller contingent than had been expected. Their procession was scarcely one-sixth of the other in numbers. Reports of important secessions from his movement have apparently been exaggerated. The Colonel explains that the secessionists were only a few young men who had "obtained permission" to act as platform orators and organizers, and that he need not even replace them by others.

Nevertheless their secession suggests that the movement has lost some of its early momentum, and it has certainly lost some of its most ardent organizers. The Colonel is a picturesque and attractive figure—a "strong silent man" who has the reputation of having conceived and executed the campaign which forced Abd-el-Krim to surrender. To some extent his reputation may even be compared with that of Colonel Lawrence "of Arabia." But it is scarcely to be expected that leaders of that type can hope to rally all the conservative forces in France against the rising tide of Republican reaction. Six months ago the Croix de Feu had become a really formidable force, all the more powerful because nobody knew how far it had captured the imagination of the young. But the "Common Front," combining all the chief parties of the Left in opposition to the threat of a Fascist *coup d'état*, has changed the situation, and the tide is now apparently running strongly in the opposite direction. The recent elections resulted in large gains for the forces of the Left, and the celebrations on July 14th suggest that the Right is unable to mobilize anything like a sufficient following to present a serious challenge to the Left.

It remains, however, to be seen whether M. Laval can obtain the approval of Parliament for his drastic financial decrees which have been imposed very soon after the Chamber went on holiday. M. Léon Blum, the Socialist leader who has wrecked so many Governments, is already in full cry against M. Laval's programme, on the ground that it taxes the poor and reduces the wages of State employees, who include such important bodies as the railwaymen and postal workers in addition to the police and the army and all pensioners, even though it adds a

full fifty per cent. to the tax on all incomes of £1,000 a year and upwards. The Chamber has refused time after time to sanction such a policy of drastic retrenchments as M. Laval has now introduced. The Budget has been balanced (or nearly balanced) only by decrees which Parliament would never have voted. It will be surprising if the decrees are ratified when Parliament meets again in October; and if they are not ratified, the hunt for a strong man capable of dominating the Chamber and the country will have to begin again. Meanwhile, the Left appears to be gaining ground steadily, and if the Right is to be identified with the semi-Fascist programme of Colonel de la Rocque and his friends, one can only hope that the Church will not be involved in support of his programme. The next election may quite probably show a further swing to the Left, which would revive much of the pre-war anti-clericalism. The Church will have difficulty enough in defending the ground which it has recovered since the war, without being involved in the anti-democratic politics of the Croix de Feu.

An important letter from Cardinal Pacelli to M. Eugène Duthoit, secretary of the annual *Semaines Sociales*, stresses the importance of this year's congress which is to be held at Angers at the end of July. The general subject under review is "corporative organization." M. Duthoit had written to the Holy Father to explain the programme of the congress this year and had expressed the hope that the great triduum for peace at Lourdes would result in special blessings upon its labours. The Cardinal replies that peace is not merely a question of harmonious international relations; it involves peace and concord in each State. "That internal order," he writes, "requires nowadays, as everybody admits, that professional life should be organized in conformity with justice and charity." Many countries are already, he notes, attempting against great difficulty during the economic depression, either to create or to revive various professional institutions that could introduce governing principles, which would be both just and effective, into economic life. The Cardinal welcomes the choice of subject for the congress and he points out certain striking pronouncements relevant to it in the encyclical *Quadragesimo Anno*, which "insists that class warfare must be brought to an end."

"In place of these conflicting classes it is necessary to substitute well organized institutions, orders or professions which will constitute groups of people, not according to their position in the labour market, but according to the different branches of social activity to which they belong." Further, it is necessary to find "for all the professions a principle of union in the common weal to which all must tend, and each, in its particular way, by the co-ordination of their efforts." For that reason "social politics must devote itself to reconstituting the professional bodies." At the same time the Holy Father insists that in reviving such bodies under very different modern conditions their practical formation should not be regulated by any

single or rigid formula. On the contrary, "men are free to adopt whatever form they prefer, provided only that it meets the requirements of the demands of justice and of the common good." But it is not enough to give juridical recognition to the corporative bodies. Catholic Action requires that they should be inspired by Christian principles; and the training in the practice of duty to the State which Catholic Action involves, must apply with special force to the duties of one's profession.

An article in *La Vie Intellectuelle* by Père Lebreton, O.P., director of the Social Secretariat for Seamen in Brittany, reveals a serious problem in the condition of the fishing industry along the Breton coast and describes an unusual experiment in Catholic social organization. Important centres of the fishing industry, with their ancient Catholic traditions and their prolific contribution to the Catholic population of France as a whole—for Brittany not only has the highest birth rate but provides far more priests than any other province, both for other dioceses and for the foreign missions—are rapidly dwindling under the stress of modern economic difficulties. Cancale, for instance, on the borders of Normandy and Brittany, has been steadily losing the population of what was formerly a flourishing centre of the fishing trade. The population of large villages, like Loguivy-Ploubazlanec, has been halved within little more than a dozen years. Many villages and little seaside ports find that the young people are drifting away to seek employment in towns like Quiberon or Saint-Nazaire further south.

Anybody who remembers the rich local traditions of these places, and who has seen the gradual disappearance of their traditional costumes—worn by men as well as by women until quite recent times—will appreciate how enormously difficult it must be to recreate the old traditions even if the present decline of population can be arrested. The decline results simply from the application of Big Business to the fishing industry, at a time when foreign trade has been severely crippled. Père Lebreton states that in the last thirty years the number of men employed in ocean-going fishing boats has fallen from 10,000 to 2,500, and the number of small coastal fishing boats has dropped from 250 to below 100. Practically every kind of sea-fishing has declined rapidly in competition with the modern steam trawlers. He regards the problem in the light of the Papal encyclicals, with their insistence upon the rights of the worker to protection in his natural means of livelihood, and he appeals for the preservation of the local fisheries as a vital necessity in preserving social stability in one of the most important provinces of France. Meanwhile the Catholic union of Seamen has obtained a membership of over 3,000 in the past four years, which makes it much the largest organization of fishermen in France. It has a valuable propagandist organ in *La Voix du Marin*, but it has not yet been able to do more than organize support for its general objects. Père Lebreton shows that its main

purpose at present is to counteract the influence of the anti-religious trade unions, and he raises an important question when he insists that its organizers should not confine its membership to those who attend regularly to their religious duties, but should try to enrol every seaman who is in sympathy with the Catholic programme and who opposes the anti-Christian doctrines of the C.G.T.

Paris is to have a new auxiliary bishop in Mgr. Beaussart, who has been appointed titular bishop of Elatea. Ordained in 1903, he has spent most of his life in connection with the Collège Stanislas, which is the most important secondary school for Catholics in Paris. Mgr. Beaussart joined its staff very soon after his ordination, at a time when the Brothers who have made it so conspicuous a success had recently been "laicised." He was appointed to take charge of its department of philosophy and he organized amongst its former students the Ciercle d'Hulst, which had become an extremely influential body even before the war. The college was converted into a military hospital during the War and Mgr. Beaussart combined his teaching work for four years with the arduous duties of being chaplain to the hospital. After more than twenty years at the Collège he was appointed rector of the parish of Saint Jacques du Haut-Pas, but three years later he returned to the Collège Stanislas as its Rector. Four years later he was again recalled to work in the archdiocese and Cardinal Verdier made him Vicar General of Paris and archdeacon of Saint-Denys.

III. CENTRAL EUROPE.

By C. F. MELVILLE.

New Nazi drive against the Church.

The Radical elements in the National-Socialist party, who, for some time after Herr Hitler's assumption of the Presidency in addition to the Chancellorship, had been obliged to draw in their horns in deference to the wishes of the more conservative elements in the Government and the Reichswehr, have, during recent months regained a great deal of their influence.

Herr Rosenberg, and the neo-pagan group, have recently come out very much into the open, and violent attacks on the Catholic Bishops and clergy are the result.

Not only does the campaign against Catholic Youth Organizations and the Catholic press grow stronger from day to day, but also the Church dignitaries are being threatened with state action because of their resistance to the Nazi encouragement of birth control and other forms of Nazi eugenics.

Herr Rosenberg's attacks on the Hierarchy are, moreover, receiving the support of Dr. Frick, the Minister of the Interior. The identification of the Nazi Party with the German State gives the Radical Nazi extremists the opportunity to assert that the resistance of the Bishops to Nazi doctrines which are inimical

to the teachings of the Church is an act of disloyalty to the State itself.

The Bishops, nevertheless, continue their resistance. They are unshaken in their determination to continue their instruction to their flocks that Catholics are forbidden to practise birth control. The same conflict applies with regard to the Nazi practice of sterilization; which the Church, of course, has condemned, and forbidden to Catholics.

The new drive against the Catholics coincides with the launching of a new anti-Jewish campaign. The revival of the use of physical violence against the Jews is another indication of the growing strength of the radical wing of the Nazi party.

It may, perhaps, be possible to account for the renewal of anti-Catholic and anti-Semitic action on the grounds that in a number of political and economic matters the Radical Nazis have had to give way to the ideas of the more orthodox and conservative elements in the Government, and that they are being allowed an outlet for their extremist ideas in the religious and cultural spheres. But whatever the real explanation, the fact remains that Herr Rosenberg and his friends have succeeded in recovering a great deal of the influence and liberty of action which until comparatively recently they had to a great extent lost.

In the meantime the efforts of the Church to negotiate with the State the regulation in fact of the various agreements relating to Catholic Action which had been agreed upon in form under the Concordat, have proved to be abortive. The situation must be faced, I fear, that these wrongs show no signs of being righted for some time to come. The slow evolution towards a more normal state of affairs which had been hoped for from an increase of the influence of the more conservative elements has not come about. The swing of the pendulum at the moment is in favour of the radicals.

The seriousness of this situation is underlined by the edict just issued by General Goering, in his capacity as Prussian Prime Minister, to provincial governors, in which the latter are ordered to take severe measures against "clerical opponents of the Nazi State."

The edict contains a long series of accusations against the Catholic clergy including the time-worn allegation that they are trying to continue, in disguised forms, the political Catholicism of the one-time Centre Party.

The Catholic resistance to the Sterilization law, and the activities of the Catholic Youth organizations, to which I have already referred, are made the subject of a bitter attack.

The Church, declares the General, must not invoke God against the State. The Church, needless to say, has never invoked God against the State. But the identification of the Nazi Party with the State, has, as I have previously pointed out, enabled the Nazi leaders to condemn, as action against the

State, the resistance of the Church to those Nazi doctrines which are inimicable to Catholic teaching.

The General's declaration ends with an exhortation to the Hitler Youth to proceed to the final conquest of "political Catholicism." When General Goering, who was not regarded as a Radical extremist, speaks like this, the forces ranged against the Church must indeed be very strong at the moment.

Austria.

A very different picture obtains in Austria where a great Catholic pilgrimage to the shrine at Mariazell has just taken place, led by the Mayor of Vienna, Dr. Schmitz.

As Herr von Schuschnigg, the Chancellor, pointed out, five or six years ago it would have seemed impossible for a Mayor of Vienna to lead a Catholic pilgrimage. (This refers to the fact that before the coming into power of the present régime, the municipality of Vienna was governed by Marxists and anti-clericals.)

Burgomeister Schmitz recalled how forty years ago Father Abel had led the first pilgrimage of Catholic men to Mariazell. In those days, he said, the Church had to combat Liberalism, from which Socialism had grown in later years, which in turn the Church had had to combat. Mgr. Seipel had died just before the new Austria had been constituted. Dr. Dollfuss had died soon afterwards. They, to-day, knew that the new Austria could survive the blows of fate.

General Vaugoin alluded to the fact that at the last pilgrimage to Mariazell Dr. Dollfuss had been in their midst.

Another declaration of Herr von Schuschnigg's refers to the law which has just been introduced into Austria repealing the previous law regarding the confiscation of the Hapsburg properties.

Under the new law the prohibition against the Hapsburgs enjoying residence and property in Austria has been removed. The greater part of their private properties has now been restored to them.

This, the Chancellor declared, was a purely internal Austrian affair, and he had no reason to ask for consent from outside. At the same time, Austria did not think of indulging in experiments or of presenting the outside world with a *fait accompli*.

There was no legal reason why the members of the House of Hapsburg should not return to their own country. Discriminatory law against them could not, therefore, be maintained. No objections were raised to members of the former German royal houses residing in Germany. Why, then, should Austrians be different from the others. The Hapsburgs were Austrians, like all other Austrians. It was not true, he said, that the restitution of the Hapsburg property meant restorationist propaganda, particularly in neighbouring States.

The restoration question, the Chancellor continued, was not an actual one. There need be no concern on the part of the outside world.

Some people said it was a sign of weakness on the part of the Government. This was not the case. On the contrary, the Government felt itself sufficiently strong to be able to make the distinction between private law and common law.

It is true that there exists in Austria a movement which would welcome back the Monarchy. So long as such a movement worked within the framework of the State and did not do anything to the detriment of peace and order and good relations with other countries, there was no reason why any steps should be taken against it. Discriminatory action in Austria to-day, Herr von Schuschnigg concluded, applied only to those elements which fought against the State.

Czechoslovakia and the Modus Vivendi with the Vatican.

It has just been announced that the Vatican has reconstituted the boundaries of the dioceses in harmony with the frontiers of the Czechoslovak State, so that any jurisdiction whatsoever of foreign ecclesiastical dignitaries over the territories of Czechoslovakia is now terminated. The Czechoslovak press expresses considerable satisfaction as this means the regulation of a complicated ecclesiastical problem which has been outstanding ever since the end of the war, and, moreover, because it sees in this settlement a further strengthening, on the political side, of the *status quo*. This adjustment has been made by the agreement between the Holy See and the Czechoslovak Republic known as the *Modus Vivendi*.

Writing in the *Central European Observer*, Dr. Alfred Fuchs, the well-known Czechoslovak Catholic writer and historian, gives an interesting and authoritative exposition of the *Modus Vivendi*. Dr. Fuchs, who is the author of a new work on Vatican Diplomacy, explains how a *Modus Vivendi*, although a less complete or formal instrument than a Concordat, can be equally efficacious, provided that the spirit informing it be right one.

From the aspect of international law this agreement is a novelty to a certain extent because it occupies a place between a concordat and a special diplomatic convention. A concordat is a complete, exhaustive agreement on all matters touching relations between Church and State. In addition, a concordat gives guarantees of direct collaboration between Church and State in several matters. The form of a concordat is prescribed in detail and is ceremonial. Moreover, a concordat is customarily concluded between the head of a State and the Pope, although in later concordats this circumstance has not always been insisted on. A special convention, does not refer to all questions of Church policy, but only to some, precisely enumerated. The *modus vivendi* is a regulation of the majority of questions of Church policy, but it is a simple exchange of

notes between the Cardinal State Secretary and the Minister of Foreign Affairs. The *Modus Vivendi* determines agreement, but not direct collaboration, between Church and State. It contains a convention on the delimitation of dioceses, on the right of nomination, on the oath of loyalty to the Republic, which the Bishops are to take, as well as determining the execution of these stipulations.

Neither the dioceses nor the provinces of religious orders will exceed the frontiers of the State. The appointment of Bishops will be made by the Holy See, but the State will have the right to make confidential, political objections to the candidatures. The execution of the stipulations referring to the adjustment of property which, following the division of the dioceses had also to be redistributed, was carried out by two Commissions, an ecclesiastical and a State. These liquidation commissions have now been dissolved and Church property in Slovakia has passed into the hands of the Church. Agreement has also been reached with the Archbishop of Breslau. The Archbishop of Prague recently made a farewell visitation to the territories of Glatz in Prussian Silesia which now definitively belong to Breslau. Against this, the part of Silesia which has hitherto been under the jurisdiction of the Archbishop of Breslau belongs to Czechoslovakia, being included in the archdiocese of Olomouc. These conditions just rectified arose when Marie Theresa lost Silesia. What the Vatican did not allow to the old Austrian monarchy has been allowed to the young State of Czechoslovakia.

For Hungary also, the *Modus Vivendi* not only means a weakening of revisionism but also the termination of ancient privileges, for the Primate Archbishop of Ostrihom crowns the Hungarian King, so that the Hungarians saw a symbol of Hungarian territorial integrity in the scope of the Church as represented by the integrity of this See. This has now been ended.

The *Modus Vivendi* is framed as to be acceptable not only to one Government but to all future Governments, however political constellations may change. The question of Huss Day is excluded from the *Modus Vivendi*. The Vatican is content with the stipulations that the feelings of Catholics are not to be offended through the Huss celebrations. The *Modus Vivendi*, of course, does not contain norms for all eventual contacts between Church and State, and several questions must be settled outside the scope of this agreement, which, of course, can later be extended and completed. With all such agreements everything depends on good will and not on literal meanings. The Holy See has just recently been convinced of this by events in Germany where the concordat, on paper, is advantageous to the Church, but in practice leads to unceasing conflict. And in this connection the words of the Bible apply: "The letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life."

REVIEWS FROM ABROAD

THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW for July contains many articles of interest and value. Mgr. H. T. Henry discusses the well-known story of St. Elizabeth of Hungary and the roses, and decides that it should, in reality, form part of the history of the other Saint Elizabeth, the Queen of Portugal. In his second and concluding article on "The Church and the Theatre," Fr. Coyle, C.S.C., examines the ecclesiastical legislation on the point in Germany, Italy, France and Spain. In "Father Coughlin and the Canon Law," Dr. Edward Dargin considers the canonical principles governing the legality or illegality of the sermons and other activities of the "radio-priest." "Life, death and the sacraments," by that very well-known writer, Dr. James J. Walsh, seeks, once again, to determine the moment of death in its relation to the sacraments and shows that, while much still remains mysterious, it seems certain that ordinarily "the spark of life . . . will not abandon its corporeal habitat without at least some delay." The longest interval between real and apparent death is found in cases of drowning and of electrocution, and it is in these cases that recovery has taken place the longest time after apparent death. In particular, in the case of electrical shocks at very high potential, the instantaneous character of the shock may intermit bodily functions, yet fundamental life may continue. Among the "Studies and Conferences" is one by Harold F. Pierce describing a highly successful form of Catholic "Revival," which led to a remarkable growth in knowledge of the Church and to a large number of conversions. The question of "Form Criticism of the Synoptics" as it is found in the works of Drs. Dibelius and Bultmann, is ably handled by Fr. F. X. Peirce, S.J.

THE HOMILETIC AND PASTORAL REVIEW for July contains a reply by Dom Michael Ducey to Fr. Gerald Ellard's "Demurrer" which was mentioned in last month's "Reviews from Abroad." In "What of the Negro?" Dr. Gillard, S.S.J., considers the possibilities of effecting conversions among America's twelve million negroes; he concludes his first article hopefully and judges that the Church's opportunity, lost at the time of the freeing of the slaves, is presenting itself again now, when rapid urbanization of the negro population is taking place.

THE CATHOLIC WORLD for July has, as its most important contribution, "The Case for the Mexican Government," by Fr. Joseph McSorley, C.S.P., a scathing criticism of the Mexican Attorney-General's essay on *The Conflict between the Civil Power and the Clergy*, and a defence of the Mexican clergy against the vile calumnies that are circulated by Government

agencies. An anonymous contributor to *AMERICA* for July 6th in "A City without a Priest," gives further details of the Mexican Anti-God propaganda. The article is written from Chihuahua, a city of 30,000 inhabitants without a priest, and is a graphic description of Catholic life in a Mexican city under the present régime.

GREGORIANUM (Fasc. II, 1935) opens with an article by P. L. Hertling, S.J., which gives "Materiali per la storia del processo di Canonizzazione." It traces the development of the process as we know it, from the "Elevatio corporis" or "Translatio," which was the ancient form of canonization, down to the beginning of the twelfth century when it was generally recognized that the Pope alone was universally competent in such a matter. Beatification did not become a process distinct from canonization till the middle of the seventeenth century. P. T. Zapalena, S.J., begins a series on the Petrine primacy in St. Cyprian, and P. S. Müller, S.J., continues his series on the Immaculate Conception in the Greek tradition. P. L. M. Balam, S.J., in "Quid colunt hindi?" examines the early Hindu traditions and concludes that the cult paid to images does not seem to be older than the first centuries of the Christian era. "Idola vero semel introducta, semper concipiebantur ab Hindis tanquam corpora visibilia quae a diis assumuntur ut praesentes fiant et, cultu accepto, suos adoratores beneficiis cumulent."

LA VIE INTELLECTUELLE for June 25th is, as usual, deeply interesting. A further article on "L'incroyance contemporaine," this time by Colonel A. Roulet, examines the methods of approach, and decides that, among other needs, may be mentioned a Life of Our Lord that will make a special appeal to the modern generation and a Catholic answer to Brunshvieg and to Séailles to be entitled: "La conscience moderne et la foi." In "L'itinéraire religieux de la conscience russe," J. N. completes a magnificent survey of hindrances to conversion among Russians. He is of opinion that the Russian opposition to Catholicism is not to be regarded as irreducible. It is a psychological, rather than a dogmatic, opposition and it is probable that it can be overcome by manifesting more clearly to religiously minded Russians the mystical life of the Church and of her saints. Among "Questions politiques et sociales," one may mention M. Prélôt's discussion of "Le Corporatisme italien" and the speech of Père Rutten, O.P., delivered in the Belgian Senate, on "Les ententes internationales des industries de guerre," an exposure of the insincerity of much contemporary talk about reduction of armaments.

LA VIE SPIRITUELLE (Juillet-Août) prints a consideration by the Abbé Viollet of certain "Principes de la spiritualité conjugale" and an article by Père F.-M. Braun, O.P., well-known as a *conférencier*, on "La charité dans la famille." M. O. Leroy contributes a graceful act of homage to St. Thomas More, and two further articles are concerned with the life and spiritual

teaching of Père Antoine Chevrier, author of *Le Véritable Disciple de Notre-Seigneur Jésus-Christ* and other works.

The Paderborn review THEOLOGIE UND GLAUBE is edited most competently and, as the organ of the Archiepiscopal Academy, can call upon the services of such well-known scholars as Drs. Norbert Peters, Bernhard Bartmann and Johann Brinktrine. The present number (1935—4. Heft) has a useful discussion of "fides informis," by Dr. Eduard Stakemeier. It is entitled: "Der Glaube des Sünders: seine Übernatürlichkeit und seine Bedeutung für das Heil." There is, perhaps, no great originality of treatment, but it is a useful presentation of traditional doctrine. In "Das Verhängnis der protestantischen Theologie," Dr. Friedrich Rintelen is insistent that, in arguing with Protestants, we should concentrate upon the fundamental error—their perversion of the New Testament doctrine of justification and their consequent failure to appreciate the mystical union of the faithful with Christ.

The July number of the RIVISTA DEL CLERO ITALIANO is a number that, according to the editorial practice, is dedicated in great part to one special subject. In this case it is Episcopal Visitations, and, in three articles, the whole question is thoroughly reviewed. D. E. M. Vismara, a Salesian, writes about Episcopal Visitations according to the mind of the Church and in the liturgy. There is also an excellent scheme for discourses in preparation for a visitation by Dott. G. Cavagna, which considers, in turn, the character and mission of the bishop, the nature and purpose of a pastoral visitation, the preparation of the faithful for the event, and the like. In spite of certain differences in our conditions as compared with those obtaining in Italy, many priests in these islands would find here a good deal of matter for meditations and sermons.

J. M. T. B.

le
st
y,
rs.
ie.
of
l:
me
in-
ual
,"
ith
or
ca-
cal

m-
eat
ta-
hly
out
and
ses
on-
the
of
dif-
in
leal

3.